



MILEAGE - BASED
USER FEE ALLIANCE

Spring 2013 Newsletter

In This Issue

[Chairman's DC Update](#)

[Executive Director's Message](#)

[Reason Foundation: In Defense
of User Fees](#)

[Oregon Completes Pilot](#)

[New Member Profile:
Washington State DOT](#)

[State Updates: Colorado](#)

[Other News](#)

[Research Library](#)

Upcoming Events



[Transportation Finance and
Mileage-Based User Fee
Symposium, April 14-16, 2013,
Philadelphia, PA](#)

[Symposium on Mileage-Based
User Fees Technology Workshop
April 24, 2013, Gaylord
Opryland Convention Center,
Nashville, TN](#)

[ITS America 23rd Annual
Meeting & Exposition, April 22-
24, 2013 Nashville, TN](#)

[2013 AASHTO Spring Meeting
May 3-7, 2013, Providence, RI](#)

[MBUFA Quarterly Meeting July](#)

This is the latest issue of MBUFA's e-Newsletter. Please use the "In this Issue" links (left) to jump directly to articles and departments of interest. We welcome any comments, suggestions and contributions of news, features or recent research for upcoming issues. -- Kevin Condon, **Editor**.

DC Update from Chairman Jack Basso

The facts around infrastructure financing haven't changed in the first three months of the 113th Congress. If anything the situation is more acute after years of papering over the gaps with appropriations from general revenues, the Highway Trust Fund is projected to run out of funds in a little more than a year's time. As gas consumption continues to lessen due to cost and expanded fleets of alternative fueled vehicles, revenue from the federal gas tax has correspondingly declined. Studies and panels of experts continue to point to vehicle miles traveled based systems as the best long term approach for transportation infrastructure financing. And we are still waiting for leadership and action from both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue to enact short and long term solutions.

What has changed, however, is the tone on Capitol Hill and in state houses which suggests a wider recognition of the problem and a greater openness to considering solutions which will generate the necessary revenue to the Trust Fund. At the Federal level, new Transportation and Infrastructure Chairman, Bill Shuster, has publicly expressed an open mind to funding new approaches. At the state level, legislators have gone beyond being open to ideas; they have taken bold steps to close the funding gap, most notably in Virginia which eliminated the retail gas tax in exchange for a new wholesale fuel tax and other fees. All told, those changes will generate more than \$1 billion/year.

There is a fresh debate around the role of the federal government in advancing alternative financing mechanisms for sustaining the Trust Fund. Should the federal government be the leader? In the



Jack Basso, Chairman of
MBUFA

23, Washington D.C. (co-located with TRB).

[IBTTA 81st Annual Meeting & Exhibition, September 22-25, 2013, Vancouver, BC Canada](#)

[20th ITS World Congress, October 14-18, Tokyo, Japan](#)

[AASHTO Annual Meeting October 17-21, 2013 Denver CO](#)

[Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting, January 12-16, 2014, Washington, D.C.](#)

MBUFA ARCHIVES
[Research Library Archive](#)
[Back Issues](#)

[Join MBUFA](#)

Our Website

[About us](#)

[Contact us](#)

Our Members

Public Sector Members

*California Department of Transportation (Cal Trans)
I-95 Corridor Coalition*

House, Congressman Blumenauer (OR) has introduced legislation which would create a nationwide pilot program. The new chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Bill Shuster (PA), has said that he prefers the system to be tested and developed in the states not driven by the Federal government. And at the state level, MBUFA Vice Chair Jim Whitty, who is Oregon DOT's manager of innovative programs and alternative funding, agrees that states need to be the proving ground but with federal support.

In my view, the federal role is critical in three ways. First, there needs to be a plan going forward to address the funding gap. Long term, distance based fees are a key component of that plan. Secondly, the federal government can play a valuable role by funding and guiding pilot programs to test the systems and respond to concerns about fairness and functionality. And lastly, the federal government is needed to guarantee interoperability and compatibility of systems.

With tax reform legislation on the table and expiration of MAP-21 a year and a half away, Congress has legislative opportunities to advance the development of distance based fees as a replacement for the gas tax. SAFETEA-LU put the wheels in motion for Congress to adopt new funding mechanisms by empowering the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission (NSTIFC) to study the problem and make recommendations. Their conclusion was, after examining a long list of options, "direct user charges are the most viable and sustainable long term user-pay option for the Federal government." The next step is for Congress and the President to support pilot programs to refine the concept and build public acceptance.

Executive Director's Report

by Barbara Rohde

This has been an exciting period for the Mileage Based User Fee Alliance. In March we received official notification of the tax-exempt status for the organization from the Internal Revenue Service. In January, the Colorado Contractors Association became a member-being our first state association to join MBUFA. Thank you CCA!!

In April, we will launch our completely updated [website](#) which has been modernized

to reflect the questions we have been receiving for two years about the issue and our organization. We will be able to update regularly information from states and localities and provide up-to-the minute information on MBUF happenings around the world.

Probably the most exciting news for the Alliance is the interest in the issue of MBUF and road usage charges (RUC) that have been





*Minnesota Department of
Transportation
Nevada Department of
Transportation
New York City Department of
Transportation
North Carolina Department of
Transportation
Oregon Department of
Transportation
Washington State Department of
Transportation*

Private Sector Members

*AECOM
Atkins
Baker
Cambridge Systematics
CDM Smith
CH2M Hill
Colorado Contractors
Association
Computer Aid
D'Artagnan Consulting
Federal Signal Technologies
IBM
International Bridge, Tunnel, and
Turnpike Association (IBTTA)
Kapsch TrafficCom IVHS
3M
Parsons Brinckerhoff
Reason Foundation
Transcore
Verdeva
Xerox*

generated from opinion leaders on Capitol Hill. We have been asked to provide updated information on projects throughout the nation to both the U.S. Senate Environment and Public Works Committee and the U.S. Congress Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. We also continue to provide information on possible pilots and trials ready to deploy in the nation if funding becomes available.

As we move toward MBUFA's third year we are offering some changes to the basic structure to provide more value for our members to be discussed and voted upon by our membership:

- 1) Hosting a State/Local DOT session in Washington, D.C. on steps to begin a MBUF or RUC program in states or localities
- 2) Hosting roundtable events for members only with key individuals in Washington, D.C. and throughout the nation with key responsibilities in MBUF and RUC issues
- 3) Creating a bank of pilot projects or trial projects that would be ready to launch if funding became available
- 4) Reworking our regular meeting schedule and agendas to accommodate the busy schedules of members and to provide more opportunity for outside presenters and group discussion.

We appreciate the strong support of our members over the past two years and believe these program changes will provide even better value for being an MBUFA Member

***In Defense of Funding Transportation
With User Fees***

*by Adrian Moore, Vice President, Reason Foundation
and Robert W. Poole, Jr., Director of Transportation Studies, Reason
Foundation*

Governor McDonnell of Virginia created quite a stir in January with a proposal to shift funding for transportation away from the fuel tax and instead use higher sales taxes. This ignited plenty of controversy within Virginia, but also much discussion in other places. It got people asking "Should we keep funding transportation with user fees, or just shift to paying for it with general taxes like everything else?"

We say not only should transportation remain funded by user fees, but that we should be shifting to more direct user fees in the form of mileage-based user fees rather than the indirect user fees of fuel taxes. And we are not alone. The National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Finance Commission (NSTIFC, on which Moore served) stated:

Looking to the future, the Commission endorses the growing consensus that transitioning to a funding approach based more directly on use of the transportation system, including

mileage-based user fees, is the right foundation.

At the heart of funding transportation is the users-pay/users-benefit principle. This principle has many advantages, among them:

Fairness: Those who pay the user fees are the ones who receive most of the benefits, and those who benefit are the ones who pay.

This is the same general principle America employs with respect to other network utilities, such as electricity, water, gas and telecommunications.

Proportionality: Those who use more highway services pay more, while those who use less pay less (and those who use none pay nothing). And cost allocation studies can determine which users are responsible for which portion of costs, so that rates can be set accordingly.

Self-limiting: The imposition of a user tax whose proceeds may only be used for the specified purpose imposes a de-facto limit on how high the tax can be: only enough to fund an agreed-upon need for investment. In contrast, Europe's motor fuel taxes are a general revenue source, and hence tend to be three to five times as high as those in the United States (though highway investment in Europe is the same or less than in this country).

Predictability: A user fee produces a revenue stream that can and should be independent of the vagaries of government budgets.

Investment signal: The user-pays mechanism provides a way to answer the question of how much infrastructure to build, assuming that the customers have some degree of say. Greater use implies greater demand and the need to expand capacity. And users of the transportation system are more likely to support more investment in the system if they are seeing value in what they get for what they are already paying. Prof. Eric Patashnik, in his book *Putting Trust in the U.S. Budget*, notes that "Taxpayers will only demand an increase in services if they perceive the benefits of the service increment to exceed the cost."

These points about the advantages of user fees hold true regardless of the details of the user-fee mechanism. In highways, America has used tolls, fuel taxes, excise taxes on tires, weight-distance taxes (for trucks) and several other minor sources, and is considering a shift from fuel taxes to a charge or tax per vehicle mile traveled. In deciding whether any such mechanism is essentially a user fee or essentially a tax, the critical question is the use of the revenues. If the revenues from a charge are strictly spent on services and infrastructure for the users/payers, it is a user fee. If the proceeds can be spent on beneficiaries other than those who generated the funds by making use of the infrastructure, then the mechanism is more of a tax.

The distinction is important, because we should be looking at shifting to mileage-based user fees, not mileage-based taxes. The advantages of the users-pay/users-benefit approach we discussed imply paying for transportation the way we pay for other network

utilities such as electricity, telecommunications, water, natural gas, etc. Hence, a mileage-based user fee should be configured as a payment for the use of infrastructure, and its amount and structure should be based on two principles:

Cost recovery-enabling the infrastructure provider to recover the full (life-cycle) costs of building, operating, maintaining, expanding and ultimately replacing the infrastructure in response to customer demand.

System management-structuring the charges to manage short-term (hourly, daily) demand for best overall service to customers.

The political expedient of shifting from user fees to sales taxes to fund transportation would harm our ability to consistently and fairly fund a growing transportation system for a growing economy, and trade long term sustainability for short term gains.

As the NSTIFC put it:

Direct user charges in the form of mileage-based user charges are the most viable and sustainable long-term "user pay" option for the federal government to raise adequate and appropriate revenues to provide the federal share of funding for the system. Both real-world examples and academic research demonstrate that VMT fee systems have the capacity not only to raise needed revenues but also to provide additional benefits, including more efficient use of transportation infrastructure, reduced environmental and social externalities, and ancillary benefits to users in the form of information for drivers.

Oregon

Completes "Road Usage Charge" Pilot for Vehicles with MPG Rating of 55 or Higher...

Bill to Adopt System Before Legislature

A 4-month pilot testing methods of a new mileage tax collection system based on an open "road usage charge system" was successfully completed in February and legislation to enact such a system into law for implementation in 2015 is now working its way through committees. The bill (HB 2453) made it out of the House Transportation Committee on a 6 to 4 vote along party lines and has had two days of hearings in the House Revenue Committee, which will shape the bill in the next few weeks before going to the Joint Ways and Means Committee. From there it would go to the floor of both houses for a vote.

The vehicles covered under the new policy will be only those vehicles rated at or over 55 miles per gallon (the new CAFE

standards are 54 MPG). Currently about 2,000 vehicles in Oregon meet that criterion.

In a unique twist, the pilot had among its 50 Oregon participants state and local transportation officials including legislators, so that policy-makers and others could have first-hand experience with how such a system would work. The states of Nevada and Washington also had about 25 participants each participating in the pilot. (The system worked well, generating very few calls to the project help desk during the pilot.)

Giving the motorist choices of market-based methods

The proposed system is based on the idea that for it to be successful it needs to provide motorists with options. For example, there were three choices of three "on-board units" (OBU) for the pilot: the odometer reporter that reports all miles driven and contains no GPS technology; the smart phone app paired with the odometer reporter for differentiating miles driven out of jurisdiction; and an aftermarket mileage locator unit that did contain GPS and an electronic map. A fourth option for factory-installed telematics (such as OnStar™, Ford SYNC™ and Toyota's Entune™) was sought but not available for testing in the pilot.

Another option for motorists is to elect out of the system altogether by paying a high flat annual tax that buys unlimited miles. The flat annual tax was based on an assumed maximum number of miles driven in a year (for example, 35,000 miles) multiplied by the tax rate. In the pilot, the high flat fee option was prorated for a three month period for the first phase of the pilot at \$45 per month, or \$135 for a three month period.

Motorists not only chose their method of reporting but also chose who collects the mileage data, processes the tax and manages accounting. Options include using the government process for these functions or certified services providers from the private sector.

Oregon has led the way in exploring mileage-based user fees, and its past efforts have helped shape the state's current approach based on market technical solutions and, most importantly, public acceptance. "Why should choices be forced on the motorists?" asked Jim Whitty, who heads ODOT's office of Innovative Partnerships and Alternative

Funding. "For example, some might not want GPS - they might not drive out-of state" (miles driven outside Oregon would not be included in mileage charges if reported as such).

Working with the Oregon ACLU on Privacy Issues

One of the most striking steps taken in working out the language of the pending legislation was sitting down with the ACLU in Oregon. The group was one of two groups (the other being manufacturers of electric vehicles) who appeared before the House Transportation Committee to express concerns over motorist privacy.

Oregon officials met directly with the ACLU and re-worked the language in the bill in a way to be acceptable to the civil liberties group. Specifically, the parties agreed to language that could be helpful to other states in drafting legislation: *"Not later than 30 days after the completion of payment processing, dispute resolution for a single reporting period or a noncompliance investigation, whichever is latest, the department and certified service providers shall destroy all records of the location and daily metered use of subject vehicles."* The language includes exceptions for the use of aggregate data after *"removing personally identifiable information"* and allows service providers to retain information only if the motorist *"consents to the retention"*.

Building Support around the State

At the direction of Oregon DOT Director Matt Garrett, Jim Whitty went on a statewide speaking tour to all of the ODOT's area transportation commissions, both urban and rural. The reception from local governments and much of the local media has been positive, helping build public understanding and acceptance of the proposed system.

The pilot "shows it works, it's scalable, and the public will accept it", Whitty said. Knowing this, the state opted to "implement it with a small group and get it operational" he said.

[\(More information about the pilot, including preliminary reports.\)](#)

(Written by Kevin Condon, MBUFA Newsletter editor).

udgets

New Member Profile

Washington State DOT



Jeff Doyle, Director of [Public/Private Partnerships](#) in the Washington State DOT is responsible for, among other things, alternative financing methods for transportation infrastructure including mileage-based user fees (or "road usage charges"). The office also coordinates with the [Washington State Transportation Commission](#) (WSTC) appointed by the governor. In addition to being the state's tolling authority, WSTC also serves as the public forum for transportation policy development.

Aligning Environmental Policy with Transportation Funding Policy

When the gas tax was first conceived, transportation funding had the only seat at the table. Reducing carbon emissions was not yet a policy goal - in Washington or anywhere else. Now, however, Washington is acting to align the policy goals in each area.

On the environmental side, one major project is [West Coast Green Highway](#), an initiative to promote the adoption and use of electric and alternative fuel vehicles along the I-5 corridor. Washington, Oregon, California and the province of British Columbia are working together on the project. As part of this initiative, Washington and its charging station partner [AeroVironment](#) provide EV drivers with a growing [network](#) of fast-charging stations along Interstate 5 (eight stations) and U.S. Route 2 (four stations).

As the state works to achieve the policy goal of reducing the use of petroleum, success will come with further erosion in revenues from gas taxes unless an alternative funding method is developed. The state is taking preliminary steps to develop those alternatives. Last year the Legislature funded an effort (*the Washington Road Usage Charge Assessment*) to determine the feasibility of a transition from the gas tax to a road usage charge. The Transportation Commission's [report to the governor and legislature](#) concluded that

- Existing systems elsewhere demonstrate there are viable concepts and technologies, ranging from simple paper-based systems to more technologically complex systems.
- Further study and resolution of several policy issues are

required before a new system can be designed.

The report also recommended to the legislature a three-stage work plan:

- **Phase One:** 2013-2015: A proposed budget of \$1.6m for public outreach, refining policy objectives, developing operational concepts and system alternatives, and to analyze the costs, risks, transition issues and interoperability.
- **Phase Two:** 2015-2017 and beyond: Pre-Implementation system development and pilot tests (budget recommendations to be determined during Phase One).
- **Implementation**

In addition to these activities, Washington is working with Oregon and Nevada to create the Western Road Usage Charge Consortium, a research and development collaborative for the states to, Doyle said, "share, examine and adopt each other's ideas" and to reduce costs of future efforts by eliminating duplicative work. "There is a draft charter" Doyle said, "and the first kick-off meeting will held in a few months." The group hopes other western states will join the Consortium in the future.

Update: The transportation budget currently in the House of Representatives provides 1-year funding of \$400k to continue the work of the Road Usage Charge Steering Committee, and that the focus next year must be limited to examination of the business case for an RUC, and development of preliminary operational concepts. Both the House and Senate budgets direct WSDOT to continue collaborations with other states that are pursuing MBUF, although no additional funding is provided to do this. "WSDOT fully intends to remain engaged with other states to share research, data and joint testing", Doyle said.

State Update:

**Colorado Contractors Association (CCA)
Testifies At Joint Transportation Committee
in Support of Mileage
Based User Fees**

CCA Executive Director Tony Milo testified this week in Denver to the Joint House and Senate Transportation Committee on the advantages of transitioning to a Mileage Based User Fee that would replace the 22 cent per gallon state gas tax and vehicle registration fees. CCA and Move



Colorado, a coalition of transportation funding advocates, are working to promote MBUFs by educating the public about its advantages. CCA and Move Colorado are planning to sponsor a MBUF pilot program in Colorado this year to demonstrate how they can be effectively implemented. Excerpts from Tony Milo's testimony:

Vehicle travel in Colorado increased by 55 percent between 1990 and 2009, from 27 billion vehicle miles of travel (VMT) to 43 billion VMT. Vehicle travel in Colorado is projected to increase by another 45 percent by 2020, to 62 billion vehicle miles of travel. Meanwhile, the CDOT budget has plummeted in real dollars by nearly 1/3. CDOT's long range plan documents a \$48 billion dollar shortfall through the year 2030 just to sustain current performance levels of our state and local transportation system.

Colorado traffic continues to outpace our ability to expand congested corridors. Traffic congestion impacts Coloradans quality of life, creates unsafe conditions and lowers productivity. Reducing congestion on our highways and surface streets will enhance the quality of life for all Coloradans and keep Colorado a desirable place to live, work and raise a family.

More fuel efficient vehicles and rising construction material and labor costs continually erode the purchasing power of the funds raised by Colorado's flat per gallon fuel tax. Every year that we wait to address this growing problem it will cost more to fix. In order to continue to grow and foster economic vitality, Colorado needs visionary leaders who will embrace a strategic long term solution to address this state's transportation needs.

The fuel tax has been a reliable, fair and equitable user fee for motorists for many years. However a number of factors have led to the fuel tax quickly becoming a failed model in terms of fairness, equity and ability to raise the funds adequate to provide Colorado motorists with an efficient, safe and reliable system of roads, streets and highways.

As vehicles become more fuel efficient motorists purchase less gas while still placing the same demands on the highway system. This reduces revenue to the Highway User Tax Fund while costs to repair, maintain and expand the system continue to increase. As alternate fuel vehicles become more popular these vehicles utilize the highway system but may contribute little or no user fees into the Highway User Tax Fund.

The state gas tax of 22 cents per gallon has not been increased since the early 90's. According to CDOT every \$1 raised for the HUTF currently has only 48 cents of purchasing power compared to 1991. Increasing gas taxes has proven to be very difficult and politically unpopular with voters.

Even if the gas tax was increased, it would eventually erode due to continuing increases in fuel efficiency and popularity of alternate

fuel vehicles. We believe that the answer for the future of funding our transportation system lies in a simple, fair and equitable Mileage Based User Fee. The current Colorado State Gas Tax and registration fees dedicated to the HUTF could be eliminated and replaced with a MBUF of about 1.7 cents per mile. While this would be a revenue neutral measure, it would capture a fair share of revenue from those driving alternate fuel vehicles and not further erode as the MPG of vehicles further increases.

Furthermore, we think the case could be made to make the fee 2-3 cents per mile dedicating the funds to improving the transportation system they are using and providing great value for the motorists and those who wish to move goods and services throughout our state. The MBUF could be implemented quickly in a low-tech manner that would ease the worries of those concerned about Big Brother watching them. It could be as simple as a self reported mileage statement that could be audited by a third party much like our emissions testing is performed.

We believe that a MBUF system is the purest and most fair user fee system there is to fund the growing needs of our roads, streets and highways. Furthermore, over time, the system could be used to better manage the system by utilizing demand pricing and provide discounts to drivers who choose to travel when traffic is lighter.

Other News

[Governments Look for New Ways to Pay for Roads and Bridges - The New York Times](#)

[The Big Move: Pay-per-kilometer System Could Be the Way of the Future - Toronto Star](#)

[A Transportation Funding Power Shift - The Governing Institute](#)

[Civil Engineers Give American Infrastructure "D+" Rating. -Governing Fed Watch](#)

[The Downside of More Miles Per Gallon - Freakonomics](#)

[Obama Proposes \\$21 Billion Infrastructure Bill - Better Roads](#)

[How Bad is Our Infrastructure, Really? - Governing](#)

[VMT: The Real Solution to Massachusetts' Transportation Funding Crisis? - Rappaport Briefing](#)

[Massachusetts Governor Vows to Veto Scaled-Back \\$500M Transportation Plan - Governing](#)

[Indiana University Policy Experts Support "Low-Tech" Adoption of Road User Fees](#)





[Can a miles-traveled tax finance infrastructure? -PoliticoPro](#)

[Confronted with Congestion Pricing, People Clamor for Transit, Gas Tax - Streetsblog DC](#)

[GAO: Mileage Fee Could Be More "Equitable and Efficient" Than Gas Tax - DC Streetsblog](#)

[Technology Stalls Minnesota's Statewide Mileage Tax Idea - Star Tribune](#)

[Loss Aversion is the Critical Barrier to Acceptance of Mileage-Based User Fees -Traffic Technology](#)

[Washington Drivers Join Oregon's Pay-per-mile Pilot Program - KING 5](#)

[Will Vehicle-Mile Fees Be a User Fee or a Tax? - CATO Institute](#)

[Mileage-Based Tax System Just Might Work - Sun Sentinel](#)

[High-Mileage Cars Mean Motorists Should Pay for Miles Driven, FL Transportation Group Says - Sun Sentinel](#)

[Robbing Peter to Pay Paul? Some States Ponder Using Transportation Funds to Solve Other Budget Problems - The Council of State Governments Knowledge Center](#)

[Delegate Ready Sponsors Bill to Fight Mileage Tracking by Maryland State Government](#)

[Vermont May Trade Gas Tax for Mileage Tax](#)

Research Library



[Connected Vehicles for Safety, Mobility, and User Fees: Evaluation of the Minnesota Road Fee Test](#)

[GAO: Pilot Program Could Help Determine the Viability of Mileage Fees for Certain Vehicles](#)

[Mileage-Based User Fee Primer for State and Local Decisionmakers - RAND Corporation](#)

[The Impact of Fuel Use Trends on the Highway Trust Fund's Present and Future -- The College of William and Mary, Thomas Jefferson Program in Public Policy](#)

[ACSE 2013 Report Card for America's Infrastructure](#)

[Road User Fees Instead of Fuel Taxes: The Quest for Political Acceptability -Indiana University](#)

[Dispelling the Myths: Toll and Fuel Tax Collection Costs in the 21st Century - Reason Foundation](#)



[15 Ways to Rethink the Federal Budget - The Hamilton Project](#)

[Examining 20 Years of U.S. Highway and Bridge Performance Trends - Reason Foundation](#)

[Report of Minnesota's Mileage-Based User Fee Task Force](#)

["Road to Nowhere: Federal Transportation Infrastructure Policy" -- Council on Foreign Relations](#)

[The Mediating Role of Motorists' Evaluation of Current Roadway Conditions in Determining Their Willingness to Pay for Future Improvements. Morgan State University National Transportation Center](#)

[Equity of Evolving Transportation Finance Mechanisms: Transportation Research Board August, 2011](#)

[I-95 Coalition Project Database](#)

[From Fuel Taxes to Mileage-Based User Fees: Rationale, Technology, and Transitional Issues. University of Minnesota](#)

[Alternative Approaches to Funding Highways](#)

[Congressional Budget Office](#)

[Click Here](#)

[The Intersection of Urban Form and Mileage Fees: Findings from the Oregon Road User Fee Pilot Program, 2011](#)

[Mineta Transportation Institute](#)

[Click Here](#)

[Guidelines for Shaping Perceptions of Fairness of Transportation Infrastructure](#)

[Policies: The Case of a Vehicle Mileage Tax](#)

[University of Nevada Las Vegas](#)

[Click Here](#)

[Well Within Reach - America's New Transportation Agenda](#)

[Miller Center of Public Affairs, University of Virginia](#)

[Click Here](#)

[A Forum on the Future of Highway Transportation in America International Bridge and Tunnel Tolls Association](#)

[Click Here](#)

[Transitioning to a Performance-Based Federal Surface Transportation Policy](#)

[Bipartisan Policy Center](#)

[Click Here](#)

[Paying Our Way](#)

[Report of the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission](#)

[Click Here](#)

[National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission](#)

[Click Here](#)

[System Trials to Demonstrate Mileage-Based Road Use Charges The RAND Corporation for the National Cooperative Highway Research Program](#)

[Research Program](#)

[Click Here](#)

[Surface Transportation Funding: Options for States](#)

[National Conference of State Legislatures](#)

[Click Here](#)

[Idaho Governor's Task Force on Modernizing Transportation](#)



Funding in Idaho: Final Recommendations

[Click Here](#)

NCHRP 08-36: "Road Pricing Communication Practices"

Transportation Research Board

[Click Here](#)

Vehicle Mileage Fee Primer

Texas Department of Transportation

[Click Here](#)

Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area - Towards a competitive and resource efficient transport system

European Commission

[Click Here](#)

Road Pricing: Public Perceptions and Program Development

National Cooperative Highway Research Program (Transportation Research Board)

[Click Here](#)

Mileage-Based User Fees: Defining a Path toward Implementation

University Transportation Center for Mobility

[Click Here](#)

Implementable Strategies for Shifting to Direct Usage-Based Charges for Transportation Funding

The RAND Corporation, University of Minnesota and National Cooperative Highway Research Program

[Click Here](#)

Multi-State VMT-Based Road-User Fee Initiative

I-95 Coalition

[Click Here](#)

National Evaluation of a Mileage-Based Road User Charge

University of Iowa Public Policy Center

[Click Here](#)

The Fuel Tax and Alternatives for Transportation Funding

Transportation Research Board

[Click Here](#)

Are We There Yet? Creating America's Future Transportation System -2009

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials

[Click Here](#)

Congressional Budget Office

How Fair is Road Pricing? Evaluating Equity in Transportation Pricing and Finance

Bipartisan Policy Center

[Click Here](#)