

TESTIMONY
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HIGHWAYS AND TRANSIT
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ON
IMPROVING AND REFORMING THE NATION'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

STATEMENT OF MR. WAYNE JOHNSON

on behalf of

THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRANSPORTATION LEAGUE

March 29, 2011

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, my name is Wayne Johnson. I am the Manager of Global Carrier Relations for Owens Corning headquartered in Toledo, OH. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today as you continue to address the critically important work of improving and reforming our surface transportation programs. I am also representing the members of The National Industrial Transportation League (NITL or the League) where I serve as the Chairman of our Highway Transportation Committee. The NITL is an association of companies that conduct industrial and/or commercial shipping throughout the United States and internationally. Founded in 1907, the organization is one of the oldest and largest associations in the country representing some 600 member companies involved with the transport of all kinds of freight using all modes in both domestic and international commerce.

My company, Owens Corning, is a leading provider of residential and commercial building materials, glass fiber and engineered materials. A Fortune 500 company for 57 years, Owens Corning

employs approximately 15,000 people in 28 countries. Owens Corning is one of the "Greenest" companies in the United States and has won numerous awards for its continuing effort in environmental sustainability. Like so many other American companies, our success in large part depends on having access to first class transportation systems and infrastructure.

In order to serve our customers, Owens Corning moves over 570,000 shipments per year via air, highway, rail and water carriage. This includes shipments over highways via flat bed trucks, van trucks, bulk trucks, and intermodal drayage trucks exceeding 495,000 shipments and over 145,000,000 highway miles per year at an annual cost exceeding \$345,000,000. At Owens Corning we contract with over 190 Smartway certified motor carriers to move our over the road shipments. We also move shipments using all of the major less than truckload carriers, all Class I rail carriers and seven steamship companies. All of these freight transportation systems are vital to serving our customers.

Mr. Chairman, the work you have undertaken in your Subcommittee is critically important for my company, for the American economy and for the nation. In our free enterprise system, we are challenged daily by the risks and competitive pressures of the marketplace. Those challenges make us better, more efficient and more productive. But at the same time, by ignoring the imperatives of maintaining and improving our national freight transportation system we are imposing additional cost burdens on American industry and the American economy. These are costs which we cannot recoup by working harder or smarter. These uncompensated costs are the result of delays created by increased congestion on our highways, in our rail yards, at intermodal connections and our ports. Transportation system congestion leads to inefficiency, longer transit times, missed schedules, higher fuel bills, lower employee productivity, production interruptions, and so on. All of these negative factors add significant costs to manufacturing and distribution processes, and these are costs that are exceptionally difficult to control or reduce. They make my job challenging to say the least.

Simply put, we need to get moving on fixing this problem, and we welcome this hearing as an opportunity to voice both our concerns and our ideas for designing solutions to the problem. I am well

aware that Washington and the American public have been focused on recovering from a deep recession and creating jobs. We need to do that, and as a representative of a major supplier of essential products for the new home and commercial building construction sector, that recovery is essential to our business. However, I and others fear that this temporary setback in our aggregate economy may have led to yet another unfortunate result that will continue to haunt us when we achieve that full recovery. In the freight transportation community there is a fear that we have taken our eye off the ball. Other priorities have pushed the reauthorization of the surface transportation programs off the front page. One result has been a continuing series of short term extensions of existing authority. We have huge transportation problems to tackle, but we have been giving the U.S. Department of Transportation one and two month "solution" sets. We all know that is no way to manage these huge sums of money and no way to solve our problems. We were gratified to hear Committee Chairman Mica say there will be no more extensions.

There is another important consideration too. The slack in the economy temporarily pulled a curtain over the problems of congestion and delay that had been making headlines daily when the economy was booming. The truth is that the problems did not go away. The chokepoints, the backups, the delays, and other indicators of a deteriorating freight transportation system that were the daily talking points of supply chain and logistics professionals around the country did abate during the recession. But as we pick up steam and resume normal and growing production and consumption cycles, the underlying causes of those ills will be revealed again.

America is under-investing in our freight transportation system. We are not paying sufficient attention to the real transportation infrastructure needs and requirements of the American economy. While it is not the subject of your hearing today, I am tempted to suggest that the same is true across the spectrum of other infrastructure needs of the nation. The renewal and growth of our power distribution, broadband, water and sewer, and transportation assets have not kept pace with the growth of our population and the demands being placed on those systems.

With respect to our nation's transportation infrastructure and its ability to support our economy and create opportunities for employment, I want to leave behind a strong and clear message that further neglect will only compromise U.S. companies' ability to be competitive. If we don't keep up we will fall further behind overseas competitors, a competition that is global and relentless. The consequences are obvious.

We've revolutionized our thinking about manufacturing, production and distribution in the United States. We moved from merely observing inventory in a static way, to a process of actively managing the flow of materials—supply chain management. But unless the freight transportation system works as well as the manufacturing or restocking processes, we are not going to be able to flow the right part or product at the right time and at the right price. "Almost-on-time" is not an acceptable standard. At Owens Corning if we do not have our raw materials on site when we need them, then we cannot make the required quantities of our diverse assortment of building products. Ours is a relatively simple process, but we are nonetheless just as reliant on the freight transportation market. Likewise, if we don't deliver our finished product to wholesalers and end-users on time, then we have only passed the problem down the chain.

In the modern context of freight transportation it is no longer appropriate to think in terms of single modes of transportation. I am the Manager of Global Carrier Relations at Owens Corning, not the company's truck person. We have people who specialize in rail, trucking, barging and so on. But I am charged with bringing all aspects of freight transportation together for the company in the most efficient and cost effective manner. American freight distribution, whether it is for manufacturing or end product consumption, is intermodal.

Carefully planned systems of freight distribution are at work for both imports and American exports. It is a highly complex and choreographed "ballet" that works well when the handoffs are clean and fast, and adds spiraling costs when confronted with missteps in the form of choking congestion, bottlenecks, long lines, delays, and so on. I have the tools I need to map my product movements over the

best routes by the right mode, to serve our production facilities on the one hand, and our consumers on the other. That is my job. What I cannot control, however, is the queue at the highway interchange or the choking traffic that we see every day in urban America. The scope and dimension of the intermodal transportation challenge is shaped by literally tens of thousands of transactions that span the American economic panorama, and millions of pickup/transfer/delivery transactions.

I do not speak for all of American industry. But among the broadly diverse membership of the NITL, there is a shared deep concern that we are adrift. Respectfully, I am urging this Congress and this Administration to move with dispatch on the hard work that lies ahead to craft the next long term surface transportation bill, and in so doing use this opportunity to examine both the present and future needs of our freight transportation system in its totality. Our transportation infrastructure requirements for a competitive future cannot be measured by the needs of each mode alone. We need to assess the needs of the entire freight transportation system.

I do not want to leave any impression that I do not understand the problems you and your colleagues face in dealing with this issue and its coupling with the challenge of finding sustainable sources of financing necessary to provide this country with the transportation infrastructure that is so vital for its economy. I can well imagine that no elected official is eager to vote to raise taxes or user fees to build roads, increase throughput in our ports or add runway capacity. I understand these are complex matters not easily resolved in our system of government. With the excellent "blue ribbon panel" studies that are available to us and their many recommendations, I believe we have a good understanding of the dimension of the challenge ahead of us. Now we need to rationally discuss the means to pay for the investments we have been delaying but now must undertake.

For the record, League members have said repeatedly that we are willing to pay our fair share of that cost. We are both users and beneficiaries of our freight transportation system. We are only too aware of the enormous cost of adding capacity, maintaining what we have and squeezing more out of

what we have. Our single proviso is that whatever additional revenues—from taxes, user fees, or other sources-- we are asked to pay be used for the intended purpose and not diverted to other pressing needs.

This Subcommittee has a major responsibility to craft the right legislation to get us moving. Your hearing today is helpful in that regard. Existing programs need to be reformed and streamlined. Additionally, new programs will have to be designed. New funding mechanisms are also an imperative. But as we move forward in that process, I would ask that you help change the way we think about freight transportation in the United States.

To begin, I and countless others in American industry and commerce believe that efficient, low cost freight transportation really matters to this country. I have heard that old saying that “freight doesn’t vote—people vote” too many times. Candidly, that is far too simplistic. When delay, congestion and high cost in freight transportation begin to squeeze out American products in the marketplace, and when those factors raise prices on our store shelves, the American public—the voters—will react. At the margin, we will lose competitiveness, lose jobs, and lose economic vitality. Those are not acceptable outcomes to sustain a growing population and a growing economy. Those are outcomes more akin to stagnation. Let’s put this “freight focus” at the top of our national transportation agenda.

Our interstate highway system was conceived in the 1950’s when America had a population roughly one half of today’s total. Yet we cannot just add more and more traffic lanes. We need to squeeze more productivity out of the resources that we have. Essential resources are finite in the private sector, and I believe we have to accept that same limitation in the public arena as well. As a consequence, we would urge the Members of the Subcommittee and the full Committee to include productivity enhancing provisions in the bill you draft.

The League has joined with many dozens of other freight transportation interests to promote reform of our vehicle weight limits on trucks to give the states the option to allow six-axle tractor trailers to carry up to 97,000 pounds on interstate highways. These six-axle trucks would of course be required to

meet the same safety standards as lighter trucks. And these trucks would be substantially more productive for every mile driven. We also support giving the states greater flexibility to permit longer vehicles where appropriate and with full respect for safety considerations. We would encourage you to include positive incentives which recognize that freight moves across state borders over well-defined corridors.

We would also respectfully urge the Subcommittee to identify and promote incentives for moving traffic to “off peak” times. This is not easy to accomplish, but we have a lot of idle capacity, especially at night, that could be used more efficiently. And we have seen market-based success in the Southern California ports with their PierPASS program which created a monetary incentive to shift container movements to night hours.

I am also testifying on behalf of the large membership of the NITL. The League has joined with an array of shipper and carrier interests to form a “Freight Stakeholders Coalition” for the purpose of drawing attention to the needs of our freight transportation system, today and in the future. The Coalition represents users and providers of freight transportation by water, truck, and rail, and is broadly representative of the diversity of American economic interests. Collectively we are concerned that the importance of freight mobility has not been adequately recognized or prioritized. Members of the Coalition remain committed to working together to raise the visibility of the improvements needed in our transportation system, and craft appropriate solutions. We hope that the Subcommittee will accept our ideas in the spirit in which they are offered, as broad principles to help shape this critically important legislation.

The Freight Stakeholders Coalition has enunciated a ten point platform of principles which captures ambitious but achievable goals focused squarely on improving freight mobility on our highway system.

Those ten principles are:

- 1. Mandate the development of a National Multimodal Freight Strategic Plan.** The next surface transportation authorization should mandate the development of a National Multimodal Freight Strategic Plan. The development of this plan should be led by the U.S. Department of Transportation, in partnership with state DOTs, cities, counties, MPOS and regional planning organizations, ports, freight shippers, freight carriers, and other stakeholders.
- 2. Provide dedicated funds for freight mobility/goods movement.** The legislation should provide dedicated funds for freight mobility/goods movement. Dedicated funds should be provided to support capital investment in critical freight transportation infrastructure to produce major public benefits including higher productivity, enhanced global competitiveness and a higher standard of living for our nation. High priority should be given to investment in efficient goods movement on the most significant freight corridors, including investment in intermodal connectors into freight terminals and projects that support national and regional connectivity.
- 3. Authorize a state-administered freight transportation program.** Congress should authorize a state-administered freight transportation program as a new core element of the federal highway program apportioned to states.
- 4. If a new freight trust fund is created, it should be firewalled, with the funds fully spent on projects that facilitate freight transportation and not used for any other purpose.** Priority should be given to nationally and regionally significant infrastructure, with funds distributed through a competitive grant process using objective, merit-based criteria. Appropriate projects that are freight-related should still be eligible to compete for other federal funding sources.
- 5. Establish a multi-modal freight office within the Office of the Secretary.** Freight mobility should be a key priority within USDOT. The Secretary's office should have staff with freight expertise who can focus on nationally and regionally significant infrastructure.

6. Form a national freight industry advisory group pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act to provide industry input to USDOT, working in conjunction with the new multi-modal freight office. The advisory group should be funded and staffed, and it should consist of freight transportation providers from all modes as well as shippers and state and local planning organizations. Despite the best efforts of the agency to function as “One DOT,” there is still not enough of a focused voice for freight. An Advisory Group would meet the need for regular and professional interaction between USDOT and the diverse freight industry, and could help identify critical freight chokepoints in the national freight transportation system.

7. Fund multi-state freight corridor planning organizations. Given that goods often move across state lines and involve multiple modes of transportation, Congress should fund multi-state, multi-modal planning organizations that will make it possible to plan and invest in projects where costs are concentrated in a single state but benefits are distributed among multiple states.

8. Build on the success of existing freight programs. There are numerous existing transportation programs that facilitate freight mobility and are demonstrably valuable. A new national freight policy should continue and strengthen these core programs or build on their principles and successes to guide freight program development if DOT is restructured and/or program areas are consolidated.

Examples of these successful core freight programs are the Projects of Regional and National Significance, National Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program; Freight Planning Capacity Building Program; Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act, National Cooperative Freight Transportation Research Program; Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program; Private Activity Bonds for Intermodal Facilities; Capital Grants for Rail Line Relocation Projects; Rail Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing (RRIF); Congestion

Mitigation and Air Quality Program, Truck Parking Pilot Program, and Rail-Highway Crossings. Funding for discretionary programs should be awarded through a competitive grant process.

9. Expand freight planning expertise at the state and local levels. Given the importance of freight mobility to the national economy, States and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) should be provided additional funds for expert staff positions dedicated to freight issues (commensurate to the volumes of freight moving in and through their areas). All states should have a freight plan as a tool for planning investments and for linking to the national freight system.

10. Foster operational and environmental efficiencies in goods movement. As in other aspects of transportation, improvements designed to achieve long term sustainability in goods movement are desirable to meet both commercial objectives— economy and efficiency—and public objectives—energy security and reduced environmental impact. Federal policy should employ positive approaches to enhance freight system efficiency and throughput with the goal of reducing energy consumption and green house gas emissions.

As you would conclude from my testimony, I and my colleagues would urge you to help reshape our transportation programs in a way that is supportive of connectivity and intermodal efficiency. We are ready, willing and able to work with you. Thank you for having this hearing, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for inviting me to participate.

WAYNE JOHNSON

Wayne is a native of Illinois where he was raised on a farm near Pittsfield along with his two brothers and one sister. After graduating from Pittsfield High Wayne joined the U.S. Navy served for 4 years where he was promoted to an E-5 Radioman prior to receiving his honorable discharge. He received his BA from Iowa Wesleyan College with majors in Business, Transportation and Accounting.

For over 35 years Wayne has worked in the field of Logistics as a shipper, carrier and educator. He has over 29 years in management responsibility with Fortune 100 companies in the United States and Mexico. Wayne worked with the sixth largest LTL and TL carrier in Philadelphia for 5 years. He has 8 years of teaching experience in the field of transportation and accounting.

Wayne is the Chairman of the National Industrial Transportation League (NITL) Highway Transportation Committee and also serves on its Board of Directors and an active member of the Rail Committee. He is on the Board of Governors of the Southwest Association of Railroad Shippers (SWARS), he is on the Executive Board and Treasurer for Americans for Safe & Efficient Transportation (ASET) and a member of Saving Our Service Association (SOS). Wayne is formally the Director of Logistics for American Gypsum Company headquartered in Dallas, TX. Wayne is presently the Manager of Carrier Relations for Owens Corning headquartered in Toledo, OH. In November 2010 he was the recipient of the NITL Logistics Executive of the Year award.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE
Truth in Testimony Disclosure

Pursuant to clause 2(g)(5) of House Rule XI, in the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include: (1) a curriculum vitae; and (2) a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness. Such statements, with appropriate redaction to protect the privacy of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

(1) Name:

Wayne E. Johnson

(2) Other than yourself, name of entity you are representing:

National Industrial Transportation League (NITL)

(3) Are you testifying on behalf of an entity other than a Government (federal, state, local) entity?

YES

If yes, please provide the information requested below and attach your curriculum vitae.

NO

(4) Please list the amount and source (by agency and program) of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by you or by the entity you are representing:

NONE.

Signature

Wayne E. Johnson

Date

3/25/11