

## Trucks Deliver a Cleaner Tomorrow

### Frequently Asked Questions

**Q. Did you develop this program in response to the rise in diesel prices?**

A. No, discussions on the program began in February 2007. Diesel was at \$2.55 a gallon then. But there's no doubt that today's skyrocketing diesel prices give us an added impetus to roll it out across the industry, and for Congress to provide the support the program needs.

**Q. Are you committed to this program long-term, or will interest wane if fuel prices drop?**

A. This is more than a stand-alone program. It is a continuation of the environmental advances made over the last quarter century. The changes we introduce under this program will be permanent and will be improved upon as new ideas and new technologies come along as the industry moves down the road toward a more sustainable future.

**Q. Don't bigger trucks mean more safety risks?**

A. No. Crash risk is a function of exposure which, in the case of highway safety, means the number of vehicles operated and the number of miles driven. Bigger trucks, such as those already operating in parts of the United States and almost every industrialized country including Canada and Mexico, are able to carry more freight. Therefore, the overall number of trucks needed to move the freight, and the number of miles operated, is lower than what it otherwise would be if smaller, less productive trucks are used. In other words, larger trucks means fewer of them are needed to move the same amount of freight. This keeps down the number of miles operated and reduces exposure and the risk of crashes. Additionally, numerous crash studies have found that larger trucks (i.e., longer combination vehicles—LCVs—such as double and triple trailer combinations) have significantly lower crash rates than standard tractor-trailer units that people typically refer to as "18 wheelers." This is the case because LCVs are driven by the best drivers in the industry (drivers are promoted in order to operate LCVs), and they are operated mainly on limited access roadways such as interstate highways.

**Q. Isn't rail transportation more efficient and less environmentally damaging than trucking? Why not put more freight on trains?**

A. As an industry, we are thoroughly committed to the efficiencies of intermodal transportation of goods. But trucks can go anywhere. Trains can't. Eighty percent of U.S. communities receive



their good exclusively by truck because that is the only option. In addition, the diesel that trains use is less refined and less expensive than the diesel used by trucks and emits more polluting sulfur into the atmosphere.

**Q. How can you be sure that truck speeds will be held to 68 mph?**

A. All new truck engines are equipped with electronic governors when they are built and are set at a particular speed when they leave the factory. A federal law requiring the governors to be set at 68 mph will ensure that the trucks will not travel faster than that. Many of our fleets have already set 68 mph or lower as their top speed.

**Q. Do you really expect truckers to use governors on their vehicles?**

A. Yes, and they already do, increasingly. A recent small survey showed that of 148 companies responding, 81 percent used governors on all or most of their trucks. The mean speed setting was 69 miles an hour. We expect those numbers to climb, because speed is linked not only to safety, but to fuel conservation, so it makes good business sense.

**Q. Don't many of your recommendations depend on government action?**

A. We certainly do need the help of Congress. A strong public-private partnership will have the most significant impact on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

**Q. Do you support government-mandated mileage standards?**

A. We support national fuel economy standards, as long as they do not compromise the performance of the vehicle. Whether voluntary or mandatory, the key is whether the goals are technically feasible, and still permit the truck to do its job of transporting freight efficiently.

**Q. Do you have a position on a government carbon policy, such as cap and trade, or carbon credits?**

A. We are watching the debate carefully, but we have no formal position at this time; we don't want to draw any lines in the dust; we want to work with Congress to find a plan that works for us and helps us achieve our goals. We do have serious doubts whether cap and trade can work for mobile CO<sub>2</sub> emitters such as trucks, and for an industry that includes large companies but also very small companies for whom the administrative and reporting burdens could be back-breaking.



**Q. Your carbon dioxide savings are predicated in part on elimination of congestion at 473 bottlenecks. Isn't that unrealistic?**

A. There is no doubt that our infrastructure is badly in need of improvement, and that the Highway Trust Fund is running out of money. However, we consider congestion to be perhaps our biggest challenge, and our biggest opportunity to make a difference to improve safety and combat climate change. We are determined to work together with agencies and stakeholders to make progress on this crucial issue. It will not happen overnight but we need to begin to address the most congested bottlenecks if we are serious about reducing emissions.

