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MEETING

Call this meeting to order. If you wish to speak, please fill out a white card. That will just leave you neutral and open for comment. We need to have these -- since this is not House staff, we need to make sure Jeanine has her information for the records. So, Members, it's not about that I don't trust you. It's just we got to do it.

Okay. I'll ask Jeanine to call the roll and members please say "here."

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:

Here.

MS. MELUGIN:

Representative St. Germain?

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:

Here.

MS. MELUGIN:

Senator Adley?

SENIOR ADLEY:

Here.

MS. MELUGIN:

Senator Smith is here for Senator Alario.

Representative Morris?

REPRESENTATIVE MORRIS:

Here.

MS. MELUGIN:

Secretary LeBas?

SECRETARY LEBAS:

Here.

MS. MELUGIN:

Thomas Grove?

MR. GROVE:

Here.

MS. MELUGIN:

Mandi Mitchell?

(MS. MITCHELL:)

Here.

MS. MELUGIN:

Mr. Jackie Adcock is absent. And Matt Johns? He's supposed to be here. Okay, he's absent.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:

We have a quorum?

MS. MELUGIN:

Yes, we have a quorum.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:

Okay. The minutes of the September 22nd meeting are in your folder.

Do we have any questions regarding these minutes?

If not, is there a motion to approve the minutes?

Secretary LeBas moves that we accept the minutes of September the 22nd.

Any objections?

Hearing none, so moved.

Okay. Since there is no new business to discuss, we're going to go ahead and move into the meat of the discussion of old business. And we have the first presentation by HNTB.

Just as a little background, earlier this year there's an unsolicited proposal we received from AECOM for the Baton Rouge Urban Renewal and Mobility Plan, or best known by most of us, as the BUMP. On the 15th of this year, in January, the proposal was presented to this authority and it was decided to go forward in reviewing the unsolicited proposal. HNTB was obtained in order to conduct the review. Today, HNTB is going to talk to us about the review and we're going to receive public comment. We're going to consider whether or not to go forward, whether to advertise for competing proposals. There's a list of factors, that as in LTA, we are responsible for looking at and evaluating -- there is a list of factors that's going to be in front of you in a minute from committee staff. And this list is also included in LTA's public/private partnership guidelines. And that's about it for right now. It's yours.

Introduce yourself for the record.

MR. GUILMIO:

Sure. I'm Brad Guilmio from HNTB. We're pleased to present our findings of the Baton Rouge BUMP unsolicited proposal. What I'm going to cover today briefly is some introductions and purpose of the project. Then we're going to talk about the overview of the Baton Rouge BUMP, the corridor that we analyzed, HNTB's approach to looking into the engineering of that, the cost formulation, the traffic and revenue forecast, and then the financial feasibility. Then we'll present the findings of the report and answer any questions as you guys
have them.

**REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAINE:**

Okay.

**MR. GUILMINO:**

First, I'm joined by Jeff Burst, project manager for DOTD, as well as Cheryl Duval, executive counsel, and we have a team of folks behind us as well.

Quickly, I think you stated the purpose, but we're doing an economic feasibility study for the project and we have presented the findings that are included in our final report.

Here's the project, as it's defined. It starts on the western end, six miles west of the new bridge, along the 190 corridor, part of which is new construction and a new route, and then along US 61. The BUMP project is express toll lanes in the median of free frontage roads.

The route that we're concentrating on is 21 miles of this, from the west of the river, all the way to just south of Jefferson.

Here is the project as it looks from sitting on the ground. It's going to be an all-electronic toll facility, with toll gantries sitting above. So basically you will be able to pay your toll and ride at 60 or 70 miles an hour along the corridor. All the tolling will be electronic. The capital cost in the AECOM proposal was 7 to 800 million.

As you can see in this diagram, the express toll lanes are in the middle, and you will have existing free lanes on the outside. So you don't ever have to pay a toll if you don't want. The free lanes are here. They're just signalized, so you're going to sit in a little more congestion than you will if you decide to pay the toll and have that reliability and time savings.

**HNTB approach:** When we look at feasibility, there are several components that we have to analyze. The first is the construction cost up front, as well as the operations and maintenance and the life-cycle costs.

The next thing we had to do is devise a tolling plan to figure out where we're going to put the toll gantries, how were we going to collect that revenue, and what are the costs associated with collecting that revenue.

The third piece is the traffic and revenue report. We did an introductory study of the T&R, of the traffic and revenue, and present those findings. And then we take all the costs and revenue analysis and we put it into a financial model, how would one of these projects be financed in the financial markets, and share with you the results of how much money could be derived simply from toll revenues of the project.

So the first thing we did is we looked at this and developed a conceptual design of the project, making sure that how it was presented makes -- maintains the proper traffic and is inside of industry best practices and standards.

We developed a cost estimate based first on the roadway portions, the ones that grade, as well as the elevated structures, which naturally sometimes you're going to go over intersections and have a different cost component because of that. Then our other costs on certain interchanges and how we had to maintain the corridor to make sure that traffic was managed properly.

Here is an estimate of our roadway capital costs. As you can see, we broke it into a few different categories, between the physical construction of it, the engineering, and then the contingency.

The total capital cost in current year dollars is going to be 775 million. Now, this is our estimate. The project isn't totally defined yet. It's still very early on. As the project continues and if it gets further refined, you know, that cost estimate will come with a little more certainty. But at this point we're at 775 million.

When we look at this in future year dollars, since we know we're not going to let this contract for construction right away, the total contract rises to 856 million. So that's kind of the target that we're looking to fund.

Routine operations and maintenance: Since this is a toll facility, we are going to assume that the toll revenues will pay for all operations and maintenance of the facility. So the DOTD would not have to put in any money to maintain the new toll lanes. However, the DOTD will maintain the existing frontage roads that they currently maintain, but they will be put in place in a better condition than they are now. So we did an analysis of industry standard of estimating how much this annual cost is going to be.
The next piece is the renewal and replacement cost. This is the annual cost of the major maintenance items. The little bit larger reconstructions that are periodically necessary to be able to make sure that the road is in operating condition so folks will want to use it and have a good experience in using that toll road. So it's a different set of assumptions. We're looking at the more major pieces. We estimated those costs as well.

So we have the capital cost and we have two sets of ongoing costs that the project will have to maintain with the toll revenues.

Now, I want to switch into the tolling aspect of it. You know, we designed an all-electronic toll facility. We looked at where we're going to put the gantries to, one, capture traffic, to make sure that we can maintain a good revenue source, to make sure that all current movements that are allowed in between interchanges are still maintained. And because these are toll gantries, you know, this is a device over the lanes, you know, you will not have to stop and pay a toll, so you will be able to go through at highway speeds.

Because there is equipment involved here, we also estimated the tolling capital costs, you know, the cameras, the servers, all of that equipment, as well as the annual operations and maintenance cost of the toll equipment. It's going to cost you some money for each transaction to be able to capture that revenue and put that to use.

I want to show you here. I know this is complicated. This is a stick diagram that we made that shows --

### REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
Go to the one right before.

### MR. GUILMINO:
Sure.

### REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
So you said total capital costs in 2014 dollars is 18 million?

### MR. GUILMINO:
Yes, yes, 18 million is --

### REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
Okay. For tolling?

### MR. GUILMINO:
Right. So this is the cost of the gantries, the cost of the cameras. You have to
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debt against it to the financial market, you get an
investment grade.
So this is our snapshot in time
of the information that we have. We looked at 14
access points. We did use the Baton Rouge travel
demand model, so all of the growth rates and the
traffic data that is embedded into those, we were
able to use. We then looked at that, pulled it
off, applied a toll to it, and developed our
traffic and revenue forecast with a whole bunch of
assumptions that we made for the type of facility
and the demographics that the Baton Rouge BUMP
fits. So the results of this was a long-term
revenue forecast.
A quick slide on some of the
methodology. You know, we did use the Baton Rouge
MPO model. It spits out 2017 numbers for 2017 and
2037. That's the framework for it. We have a
bunch of factors that go into that analysis.
But we did look at travel time savings in the
morning peak, the afternoon peak, midday, as well
as overnight. Willingness to pay and value of time
are two driving factors to how often and how often
-- or how much people are willing to pay for this
facility. Remember, this facility has free lanes
directly next to it, so we did apply some
conservatives in the forecast to make sure we
accounted for that.
Here is a summary of our
results. We used 20 cents a mile to get to the
toll rates. That's what you're going to pay every
time you go a mile. Basically you're going to pay
20 cents. The whole mile is 21 miles, only 18 of
those are tolled. So if you're going from one end
to the other, you're going to pay a total of
approximately $3.60.
When you look through this
table, if you look at these middle rows, this is
your travel time savings. So as you can see here
is because the existing lanes along Airline and 190
are so signalized, the free-flow traffic produces
significant time savings in the peak periods, you
know, 21 minutes, 26 minutes, 25 minutes. So the
people that are using the facility are definitely
getting an advantage over sitting in signalized
traffic.
A couple of comments from the
report that we -- of the analysis that we did. The
majority of the users along this facility are on
the I-12/Airline Highway corridor. We did not see
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a substantial amount of folks bypassing I-10 and
using this facility. And one thing about the
traffic is there was strong midday traffic, so
there's a lot of bidirectional traffic all day
long, which is not a commuter facility, where you
see everybody going to work in the morning and
everybody in the afternoon. So there will be
demand on the corridor throughout the day.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
On I-10 or --
MR. GUILMINO:
On the BUMP.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
On the BUMP.
MR. GUILMINO:
Here's our gross revenue
stream. I have it graphically on the slide below
because these numbers are way too small.
But basically you see, we have
a couple of ramp-ups where people are getting
used to the facility, and then it quickly gets into
the full revenue line. I'm going to present it to
you in two ways, right.
The first one is the lower blue
line. This is 2014 dollars. So as you see, you
know, it starts out at 27 million and gets to 40
million in a few years. When we assume inflation
of two-and-a-half percent, that's the red line,
that's what we're actually looking to finance
against, is the inflation-based revenue curve.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
You're going to give us numbers
out loud because --
MR. GUILMINO:
Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
-- you're talking to a first
grader here.

MR. GUILMINO:
Yes.
In 2022, the annual revenue
number is $27 million, next year, 2023, 31, then 35
million. By the time you get to year five, you're
at $39 million. And then it grows slightly, as
there's a small amount of growth, organic traffic
growth on the corridor, and then we apply inflation
on top of that as well.
Since HNTB did come up with
this traffic and revenue report, we wanted to make
We used 40-year tax exempt debt, we used a federal TIFIA loan, and, like I said, I developed two different scenarios. The first one is the market stabilize case. Right now we're in a very aggressive financing time. Interest rates are very low. It's attractive. Investors are hungry for yield, which basically means it's a great time to finance a project. Since we know this project is not going to -- still needs further development for the next few years, I wanted to present a more market stabilized case in case the fed raises rates or the market changes. So I wanted to give you a financing range, so I did present two separate cases, you know, for you.

I'm not going to go into the reads on these, but I just wanted to make sure you know that, you know, we did model out senior debt, subordinate TIFIA debt, there's coverage, how much debt can the revenue stream -- how much debt can you structure against the revenue stream, and there is a private equity component for the project.

Here's the summary results, right. So the top line is your capital costs. This is what you're trying to be able to finance.

---

construction costs in order to get this project undertaken.
So what I did was I developed a financial model. My background -- I was a former investment banker for Citigroup for quite sometime. So I developed a financial model, I looked at transactions in the recent markets, and developed two different cases for the financial model. Obviously, the financial markets change a good bit, so the results of this I tried to create a range to show how the financing potential could be impacted, but these results are based on the assumptions that we used to develop it. If the capital costs or T&I change over time or get refined, clearly, the financial capacity and the feasibility will also be modified.

The approach that I used to develop this financial was a 50-year toll concession. This is where the private sector will come in, design, build, finance, operate, maintain your road. They won't need any assistance ongoing. They will have all the risks of the traffic and revenue, the equity that they put in, as well as the debt holders. So there will not be any ongoing monies required from the state.

---

So it's 877 million. If you look at the market stabilized case, senior debt, 195 million, we can produce 185 million of TIFIA, the revenue stream supports private equity of 100 million. So the total up-front proceeds is 480 million.
So under this set of assumptions, the private sector would be able to deliver $480 million to cover the up-front capital costs. When you divide, you know, that 480 over the capital costs, the 877, you'll see that that's 55 percent financial feasibility, which means there's a gap of 397 million that needs to be covered by someone, most likely some public entity.

**REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:**
It's 45 percent -- it would be 45 percent of the project?

**MR. GUILMINO:**
The 45 percent would have to be publicly subsidized or, yeah, that's the gap that we would be needed. Under the attractive market case, interest rates are lower, we're a little more aggressive on the debt, naturally means you can deliver more up-front financing towards the...
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1 project. When you switch the attractive case, it's
2 $593 million up front, which means that public gap
3 is now 284 million, and, you know, the feasibility
4 percentage is 68 percent. So this is the result of
5 our preliminary analysis.
6 So our findings: Capital cost,
7 775 million, the feasibility range, if all of these
8 assumptions hold true, is somewhere between 55 and
9 68 percent. There's a gap of 284 million and 397
10 million. If the project was refined or value
11 engineered or anything changed, obviously, this
12 would change, but this is our independent snapshot
13 of our view of where the project is.
14 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
15 And so can you give us a little
16 background on what Baez said?
17 MR. GUILmino:
18 Yeah.
19 So they looked over analysis
20 and in the report they actually have a few
21 paragraphs on some of these major areas.
22 The methodology was sound. All
23 of our assumptions generally looked good. There
24 was some discussion over a few of these. In some
25 cases we slightly changed our assumptions to
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1 reflect their view. So we did take the input that
2 they've seen in recent projects. But, you know, as
3 the report says, you know, our methodology and
4 outputs, you know, look very reasonable.
5 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
6 Okay. All right. I'm
7 looking for -- Senator Adley?
8 SENATOR ADLEY:
9 Just to summarize what I've
10 heard now. The project would move 1.9 percent off
11 of I-10, but would be more relief for Airline and
12 I-12; did I hear that correctly?
13 MR. GUILmino:
14 Yes, our --
15 (** Tepe goes blank.)
16 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
17 -- great projects out there
18 and the BUMP is one of them.
19 But at the end of the day, when
20 we leave here, Senator Adley and I, both, are not
21 going to be saddled with that responsibility. So
22 doing anything going forward, we need to weigh in
23 and make sure this legislature is ready for what we
24 leave behind.
25 Do we have any known sources of
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1 public funding that would put that gap in at this
2 point? That's kind of general, but I just -- I
3 need a general correct answer.
4 MR. BURST:
5 No, ma'am, not at this time.
6 We don't have any other identified funding sources
7 that would be sufficient to fund that gap.
8 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
9 Okay. Because at the end of
10 the day we, right now, don't have any extra money
11 in DOTD for any of these wonderful projects. So
12 just putting that out there for one simple reason,
13 we need to raise funds for transportation and this
14 is an important project. And whatever we decide
15 today it is one of the most important projects.
16 So, you know, we are leaving
17 but Gary and Jim are not, and at this point in time
18 we just need to have further discussion, because I
19 need to feel a little bit better about things and
20 we're going to have AECOM come to the table also.
21 Any other questions from the
22 members?
23 Okay. All right. And then
24 we'll have public comment right after that. And I
25 do -- members of the East Baton Rouge delegation
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1 want your public comment, especially from you all.
2 Okay. Now it's your turn to
3 give me some information.
4 MR. SCHMIDT:
5 Well, thank you --
6 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
7 Introduce yourself again.
8 MR. SCHMIDT:
9 Thank you, Madam Chair.
10 My name is Bob Schmidt, and I
11 represent AECOM's practice in the state of
12 Louisiana. And to my right is Dick Wolfseld. He
13 is AECOM's vice-chairman of transportation for
14 North America. And so we're glad to be here before
15 you and be able to speak to the BUMP project.
16 The first thing I wanted to
17 reinforce, I guess, is that there's three primary
18 purposes of the BUMP, three reasons why we believe
19 it's a good project and why we chose to invest in
20 the development of the project.
21 The first is to relieve the
22 I-10, Mississippi River Bridge and the I-10
23 approaches in East Baton Rouge Parish. Currently,
24 there are no real good alternatives to get back and
25 forth across the river. It funnels all the traffic
through the heart of Baton Rouge on I-10.

Additionally, there are no good routes for incident management. We see incidents out on the I-10 system all the time. Each time there's an incident, there's no way for traffic to get around town, particularly to cross the Mississippi River, because the system of arterial streets just cannot process the load.

The second reason that the project is good, and the HNTB report validated this, is that it's going to relieve a lot of existing congestion in the Airline Highway corridor. Right now, in the afternoons, the average travel speed along Airline, through 26 traffic signals, on the east side of the river is 12 miles an hour. And so there's just going to be a tremendous relief of burden and quality of life impact to East Baton Rouge Parish residents.

The third reason is that the project has a real good chance to stimulate the redevelopment of the older part of the Airline corridor, north of Florida Boulevard, which has, since the advent of I-10, seen a decline. And so the project, the investment of the project into that part of the corridor within the right-of-way, along with other legislative and ordinance things, can serve to stimulate redevelopment.

Real quickly, HNTB did mention the cost of the project at around 775 million to 800 million. I wanted to reinforce there's no tolls on the old bridge. The first phase of the project, what they call SIU 1, is 20 miles long. And a motorist, just as they can today, can drive those entire 20 miles for free, without paying a toll. Or a motorist could -- and that would be through the traffic signals and at the slower speeds that we experience today. Or a motorist could choose to pay a toll and travel from end to end, those 20 miles, at 60 or 70 miles an hour, nonstop. It would be an interstate-style roadway.

So really we have two corridors -- two roadways in the same corridor.

One of the great things about the BUMP is that there is existing right-of-way out there. It's 200 feet wide in most cases, sometimes 300 feet wide in the developed areas. So that there would be no significant additional right-of-way acquisition needed, voiding business displacements and residential displacements, environmental impacts that you sometimes see on other projects.

The project gives us a chance to modernize our system. You know, I-10 and I-12 were constructed in the 1960s, as was the Airline corridor before that even. And so the opportunity of the BUMP is to have a chance to modernize. We modernize our homes, we modernize other things in our lives regularly. This is a great chance to bring that system up to speed.

And then finally, and I think this is so important, is that the investment into the BUMP is $800 million, of capital investment. This is what AECOM proposes to do. With the value of the system, when it's finished, from end to end, is going to be somewhere in the neighborhood of $1.5 billion to 2 billion, that's because we can incorporate existing assets that are out there today. Such as the Old Mississippi River Bridge, the four-level stack interchange with I-110 and Airline Highway, all of the existing rights-of-way. And so the value that we get is going to be a lot greater than the $800 million investment.

We proposed a schedule to open the project in 2022. By highway standards that is light speed, and we acknowledge that. But one of the things that the project has, that traditional projects don't have, is the pressure of the toll road and the public/private partnership process to overcome hurdles and accelerate things. The reason being that the investors in the project are going to insist on recovering their investment through tolls just as quickly as possible. And we can't collect the tolls until the road is open.

So I'd like to turn it over to Dick now. We really have a three-prong discussion for you. The first is to talk about HNTB's evaluation and revenue estimates and finance analysis. The second is to talk about some system traffic characteristics that I think are going to be very helpful to understanding the value of the BUMP, and then finally our conclusion and request.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:

Yes, sir.

MR. WOLSFIELD:

As was mentioned by HNTB in order to do --

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:

Please reintroduce yourself,

I'm sorry, just for the record.
MR. WOLSFELD:

No problem. I'm Dick Wolsfeld
with AECOM.

In order to do a financial
feasibility on a project, you have to make a myriad
of assumptions. And they've talked a little bit
about some of them. Trying to forecast interest
rates probably three to four years from now, that
would set the finances, but we have to forecast
over a 20-year period. What's going to happen to
inflation, how is traffic going to grow, how's the
region going to grow, and then what percent of that
can we capture.

And Baez report pointed out
many of those assumptions that we have to make.

We're in general agreement with
HNTB's analysis on the cost side of the equation,
in terms of the capital costs. And we're very
pleased that two engineers could come up with an
estimate that is relatively the same. That
shouldn't surprise anyone because you've got
history on what capital costs are and you've got
some, albeit, very preliminary drawings, you can do
a pretty good capital cost estimate.

On the traffic and revenue, or
the T&R side, it's significantly more difficult
because you're forecasting over a much longer
period.

I can say right now that if our
analysis indicated that after the ramp-up, the
revenue is going to be in the neighborhood of $35
million and then it's only going to grow at $.35
percent over the next 20 years, we never would have
submitted the proposal that we did. We would have
come in and said we can fund 400 million of the
project, but the public sector is going to have to
put up 350 million. So the investment that we made
in doing this lead to a very different conclusion
about the project and is the reason that we
submitted what we submitted.

So what are the differences,
and I'd just like to go over a few of those.
First is you got to look at
annualization factors. That's what's the typical
number of weekdays that the roadway will function
as it would on a typical weekday. We looked at,
from the DOTD, hourly traffic volumes, seven days a
week is actually 12 months of data. The volume on
Saturday is almost equal to the weekday volumes for
eight to ten hours a day, which probably shouldn't

surprise any of you as you drive that.

Other projects around the
country: Foreign Dallas used 335 days per year,
Austin, 327, Houston, 325. We used 325 days.

Does it make a big difference?

Not really, but it does add three percent to the
net present value of the analysis.

The second one, and probably
the key one, is how much is traffic going to grow
in the region, in the I-10 corridor, and in the
BUMP corridor? Well, traffic generates, based on
population and employment, plus two trips that are
going through the region and your regional planning
agency forecast that population is going to grow 23
percent over the next 20 years and employment is
going to grow 21 percent.

Historically, traffic has grown
a little faster than population and employment.
Recently that has not happened, but historically
that has happened. Probably has a lot to do with
the price of gasoline, which is another thing, who
can forecast that.

Historically, and you tend to
look back before you look forward, historically,
traffic has increased on I-10 at 2.7 percent per
year. So to use $.35 we would say is a little very,
very conservative.

Baez looked at all kinds of
traffic information, and their conclusion that I
read in their report says that the summation of the
traffic increases in the area are 1.3 percent per
year. That's their numbers, not our numbers. If
you use 1.3 percent, growth in traffic, versus $.35
percent increase, that makes a pretty significant
17 percent increase in net present value of cash to
the project. And there's that graphically shown.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:

Oh, I'm sorry. Hold on one
second. Senator Adley?

SENATOR ADLEY:

Take a moment to ask you a
question about this number, because you may have
heard me ask the staff a moment ago about going
beyond today and asking questions about the
project. So that being the case, I need to know is
it fair for me to assume that the difference that
we saw in the first report we got, that showed the
cost to the State around 400 million, is this, what
you've just presented us, would be the reasoning
why the cost would not be 400 million to the State,
because of a difference in the numbers that are used to calculate the return?

MR. WOLSFELD:
Yes.

SENATOR ADLEY:
So if I had asked you the question, would you present to me something in writing to show me the difference, this would be it?

MR. WOLSFELD:
It would include at least that, but yes, it would include that.

SENATOR ADLEY:
Okay. Thank you.

MR. WOLSFELD:
All right. So the next one is the value of time. If I'm going to make a decision to go on the BUMP and pay a toll, I've got to say that's of some value to me. So how do I value that before I make the decision I'm going to pay the $3.60 if I'm going from end to end?

And a lot of people use $10 an hour, some people use $15 an hour. There's been a previous study in the region they used $20 per hour. I just read a new piece of tollway from I-70 from the ski areas down to Denver, they're going to price out at $2.30 per mile for 11 miles. So I could pay up to $30 to use that. So if I'm coming down from the ski area, they're saying people are going to value their time at a very, very significant rate.

If you use $15 per hour value for travel time savings, you get an additional eight percent net present value in terms of cash. And you can see that graphically.

The next one is the basic toll rate. And historically, tolling revenue agencies, toll agencies, are able to increase tolls above inflation. And there's some examples there, SH 121 in Dallas, SH 130 in Austin. And in our base analysis, which we put in our confidential proposal, we said that the basic toll of 20 cents per mile is a good starting point, but that that would increase at one percent per year above the CPI Index. If that assumption holds true, you get a 24 percent increase. And that's obviously the larger one. So that's a very important assumption. Can't, will, either, because people will value their time higher or the congestion will be so bad that people will use it. So we've assumed you could increase the toll rates one percent per year above the CPI Index. And that's the graphic of that.

The last one is that probably contemporary toll policy is that you do dynamic pricing. What does that mean? I change the price of the toll based on the situation. If it's 2 a.m. in the morning and there's not a lot of traffic on I-10, it's going to be very hard to attract someone to use the BUMP project. So it might be cents per mile to get them to go. In the p.m. peak hour, when the congestion is the worse and the line is the longest, I think I could get more than 20 cents per mile in terms of the toll.

So you dynamically price that based on time of day, level of congestion, and analysis indicates that you generate additional revenue over and above the fixed rate of 20 cents per mile. I think fairly conservative. In Dallas they're getting something like a 50 percent increase with dynamic pricing over a static rate.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
Let me just give you a little concern I have, just from what I'm listening to. So this is not an opinion. This is just, you know, I'm taking what you're saying.

We talked about Denver, and, of course, if I'm going skiing, then I'm going to take the toll road. Absolutely. They have a lot of tourists. This is a little different, Airline Highway, so I know you --

MR. WOLSFELD:
Right.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
-- you've factored all that in.

In Dallas, we're still in a part of town that is work-related, people who live there all the time. So I just want to make sure we -- we know that -- we know you say you can charge more. I don't want you to get less --

MR. WOLSFELD:
Right.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
-- in my aspect of this just first grade analysis. Trust me, I'm listening.

Okay. Thank you.

MR. WOLSFELD:
But just so you know, the assumption we used was 20 cents per mile, increase
REP. ST. GERMAIN: Correct. I’ve been trying to get CPI attached to everything and they won’t let me.

MR. WOLS Feld: All right. So if you add that -- if you add all of those, the 42, 43 million in 2050 jumps up to over double that amount. So that gap, our analysis is that there is a good chance there will be no gap, because maybe not all five or six of those will happen but three or four of those will happen. And in the composite I only have to go up about 70 percent and the project is then financially feasible to pay 100 percent of the debt of the project and to return a -- have a return on the $100 million of private equity that’s required for the project. So it was this analysis that we did that lead us to the conclusion that there’s a high probability that the project can be supported with tolls.

And we found it interesting, when you go into the Baez report, on page 11, they put three different scenarios, a conservative, a likely and an aggressive. Now, this is relative to traffic. It’s not relative to the funding scenarios. This is the traffic.

And the point I want to make here is that the difference goes from 13,900 to 46,300. That’s a big range. So when someone says it’s 42 million and we think it’s closer to 70 or 80 million, that’s actually within the bounds of the analysis that they had.

So going back to this list of assumptions, you don’t have to change those assumptions very much, and the project turns from having a significant capital subsidy needed to be feasible to one that generates that.

Now, I think I could say that -- and I wasn’t here, that the legislation that was passed anticipates that. They say that you may have a pre-development agreement during which you would do those investment grade revenue studies, you would do better capital costs, you would do the feasibility of the project with your selected consultant -- and we fully expect there to be competing proposals, and if we don’t win, we don’t win -- and then at the end of that PDR, or pre-development agreement, you say yes or no. And if you say no, it’s over. If you say yes, then you go to a comprehensive development agreement, which lays out the specifics in more detail, and then there’s a financial close. But the CDA, comprehensive development agreement, may not go also. And you’ve got another up or down and then you proceed.

So that is what your legislation allows, and our view is that this project has enough promise that it’s appropriate to enter that PDA phase.

REP. ST. GERMAIN: From my standpoint, where I sit at, and my responsibility, the bottom line is do we have enough money to go forward, do we see enough in this feasibility study, do we have one yet, how much is that going to cost before we decide one way or the other? Do we have to have all of those things within the guidelines whether to go forward or not today if we chose to -- whatever decision we chose to make?

So if I could have legal from DOTD. Where you at, Cherry? I’ll just have her answer that question, while you’re on it, so we make sure we’re all together.

MR. WOLS Feld:

Okay.

REP. ST. GERMAIN: I don’t want a question 20 minutes from now and -- so did you get my question?

MS. DUVEILH: Would you repeat it?

REP. ST. GERMAIN: I can repeat it. He was talking about the stages we’re in now, and what we, as an LTA, have the responsibility to do, we have to have before we make that final decision. And that’s within the selection for PPP, which I love.

PPP, so --

MS. DUVEILH: Right. I mean, what the LTA would have to decide is whether -- if they’re going to go forward, they have to find the money and conduct a procurement process and advertise this proposal. Take other proposals, analyze those, and then they would decide which one to pick, and then start negotiating a pre-development agreement.

REP. ST. GERMAIN: Okay. So today, this is strictly about whether the proposal goes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 42</th>
<th>Page 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. forward --</td>
<td>1. spend our money on that evaluation instead of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>MS. DUVIEILH:</strong></td>
<td>2. spending our money on negotiation back and forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Right, whether the --</td>
<td>3. with parties right now before we get to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAINE:</strong></td>
<td>4. conclusion we really think this is the one we need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. -- not the BUMP, not the</td>
<td>5. to move with; is that correct?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. discussion of the project?</td>
<td><strong>MS. DUVIEILH:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>MS. DUVIEILH:</strong></td>
<td>Yes, sir, you're correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. No, this is whether to</td>
<td><strong>SENATOR ADLEY:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. advertise AECOM's proposal, to get other proposals</td>
<td>Okay. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. contrary to theirs or in support or -- and</td>
<td><strong>REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAINE:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. negotiate with different parties. So you're</td>
<td>Darn, you do pretty good for a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. looking at a procurement process, which in itself</td>
<td>non-attorney. I don't.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. costs a substantial amount of money.</td>
<td>Senator Smith?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAINE:</strong></td>
<td><strong>SENATOR SMITH:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Okay. And we might need DOTD</td>
<td>Thank you, Madam Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. later to come up and give us that amount. But I</td>
<td>Not so much for the legal, just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. want everybody to be on the same page so the</td>
<td>before we get on to the next section and move to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. members here that haven't heard everything, maybe</td>
<td>the next section, I have a few questions about how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. missed a meeting or two, get all the information.</td>
<td>you went through some of the questions here. And</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. So okay. Thank you, that's</td>
<td>one of them was on your dynamic pricing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. it.</td>
<td>I mean, of course, if you're</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Yes, sir. Senator Adley? Hold</td>
<td>going to increase the price of the tolls, depending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. on, Cheryl.</td>
<td>on what time of day it is and traffic flow, you're</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. <strong>SENATOR ADLEY:</strong></td>
<td>going to lose some of that as well. And you're</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I'm not trying to repeat what</td>
<td>going to lose some of those individuals that may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. we just heard, but I want to make this very clear.</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. If today we made the decision not to move forward</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. with the proposal and we have X amount of dollars</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. at our disposal as I understand it to continue to</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. evaluate this project, in lieu of getting in direct</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. negotiations with different parties, we have the</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. option to continue to evaluate the project itself</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. based on all the information we gathered. And at</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. that point, we could then turn around and open it</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. up to all parties to participate; is that right or</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. wrong?</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MS. DUVIEILH:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. That is correct.</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SENATOR ADLEY:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. So if today you didn't move</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. forward with this proposal, which limited us to</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. this discussion, with this group, you could move</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. forward, continue with this project -- now, I'm</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. asking the question because what we've seen here,</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. in all of our discussions, there's about four or</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. five projects that are needed in this area to help</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. solve this problem. There doesn't seem to be one</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. that does it all. Each one of them has got merit,</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. but the concept is, as I understand it, we could</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. move forward, continue to evaluate the project, and</td>
<td><strong>Further text on Page 43</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Okay. Yeah.

MR. WOLSFIELD:
So we modelled that and came up
with the number that we did.

SENATOR SMITH:
Yeah, because I can certainly
appreciate where you're coming from with it, and I
think it's a realistic thing. I just didn't know
-- you had mentioned some of the other markets,
like Dallas and some others that use this dynamic
pricing, so I figured they had to have some kind of
statistics on you lose X percentage. Even though
you're going to gain some revenue, you're losing a
percentage of participants.

MR. WOLSFIELD:
For the not very often,
actually the revenue has been higher than most of
us have predicted it would be. That's been the --
that's been the experience.
Another case is the Illinois
toll road. They doubled their toll rates. It's
not dynamic pricing. It's fixed. But they lost
virtually none of their usage on the thing. So
they're not -- now, Chicago is not Baton Rouge,
Scary is not Baton Rouge, Dallas is not Baton

SENATOR SMITH:
Exactly.

MR. WOLSFIELD:
Right.

MR. GUILMINO:
One other thing about dynamic
pricing, it's also called congestion pricing. And
the goal is not only to maximize revenue during
peak periods of the day, but to manage down the
amount of traffic on the facility, so that you
constantly have free flow --

SENATOR SMITH:
Yeah, I can appreciate that.

MR. GUILMINO:
-- as opposed to too many
people trying to use the facility and you have
congestion and it doesn't serve its purpose,
so --

SENATOR SMITH:
Right. Going into that, one of
the other things you did was you determine -- you
were basing some of your numbers off of population
growth. And I don't -- I'm not from the Baton
Rouge area, but, I mean, we know we had the

Because, you know, one of the goals of this
corridor is to help Baton Rouge traffic, but also
to help the I-10 traffic, which we're seeing it
doesn't do as much as we'd hoped.
But as these individuals move
outside the areas, I mean, I can see where you
may have population -- traffic population
increase but not necessarily population increase.
So I just wanted to --

MR. WOLSFIELD:
Those numbers -- we did not do
those. Those are done by the regional planning
agency, which is done as the basis of the traffic
model. So we're just reporting what they put into
the traffic model, the 23 percent and the 21
percent. Those are not our numbers.
I want to go back -- a
footnote --

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
Absolutely.

MR. WOLSFIELD:
-- when we say we raise the
tolls, the word "gouging" will come up. I want to
say that if you do a comprehensive development
agreement, you have the right to specify a maximum
rate, toll rate that you can charge. You can
negotiate anything into the agreement that you want
to.

So if the public policy says
this is the maximum we're going to charge, that's
part of the comprehensive development agreement,
which probably would be less than what the -- it
would be less than what you might do to maximize
revenue. Might not be, but might be.

SENATOR SMITH:
My last question, I believe
anyway, on the financing aspect of it is you made a
comment at the beginning that this really is a --
you know, it's a great value because you're going
to spend 870 million, something in that range, for
a 1.5 to $2 billion completed structure because of
the bridge.

Have you taken into account the
dollars that would be needed to increase or what do
we have to do to make this bridge ready to handle
the traffic that may be increased over the bridge,
and who's going to pay for that, is that in these
dollars?

MR. GUILMINO:
I'll speak to that and Dick may

have some comments.

Right now that bridge is a
four-lane facility. It's two lanes in each
direction, without shoulders. And to kind of key
you into that, the I-10 bridge, at downtown Baton
Rouge, that bridge is three lanes each direction,
without shoulders. And so they're very similar in
that regard.

Currently, on the old bridge,
where the BUMP is proposed to utilize, the DOTD is
investing significant funds, I think it's about 80
million, to do some structural repair on that
bridge and to paint that bridge with the intent
that it's going to sustain for another 40, perhaps
more, years as a critical part of the Baton Rouge
transportation system. Certainly we need that
bridge.

The other thing to realize
about that bridge is it carries a railroad, a
mainline railroad. And it's certain -- I think
there's one thing that's certain. Either that
bridge will continue to function to serve these
mainline railroads, that will happen, or there will
be a new railroad bridge built across the river
somewhere, if that old bridge was ever to be
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desired to come out of service or nobody wanted to
maintain it.

So that's one of the reasons
why we, when we looked at this, feel very
comfortable about the sustainability of that old
bridge into the future to serve the term of the
finance plan that we would offer to build the
project.

And so right now, the bridge,
as it stands, has a capacity, and average daily
traffic is the lingo that the traffic engineers
use, of about 70,000 vehicles per day, roughly. It
could be a little more, it could be a little less.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
That's with the project as
proposed?

MR. GUILMINO:
That's the existing bridge, as
it stands out there today, it has that capacity.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
Okay.

MR. GUILMINO:
The traffic on the bridge today
is about 28,000 vehicles per day. So it has
tremendous reserve capacity to accept more traffic,
going to wear the bridge out quicker. And when we wear the bridge out, we're not talking about any kind of numbers in here or who is going to make those major repairs or replacement of that bridge, which would probably fall on the State at this time as I can see it and so on. Just make sure we're looking at the whole picture is all.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
You're welcome.
Secretary LeBas?

SECRETARY LEBAS:
You were doing a comparison of the new bridge versus the old bridge, so you talked about the three lanes in each direction on the I-10 bridge, no shoulders, two lanes in each direction on the old bridge, as we called it. But what about the lane width? I believe there is a difference in the lane widths between what's on the I-10 bridge and what's on the old bridge.

MR. GUILMINO:
Yeah, the lane widths -- the deck surface on the old bridge is 24 feet from the face of the curb on one side to the face of the curb on the other side. And so I guess you could say that the lanes are 11 foot wide with a one-foot offset to the face of the curb.

On the I-10 bridge, I believe this to be true, the lanes are 12 foot wide, three lanes at 12 foot wide with a one-foot offset to the base of the barrier or the curb.

SECRETARY LEBAS:
Senator Smith, I just wanted to bring that your attention, because when you do have narrow lanes, there is -- people drive a little bit differently on narrow lanes than they do the full 12 feet. And I wanted to point out that difference in those two bridges. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
I'll point out the difference of it's just plain scary. In my -- (someone else speaking, inaudible.)

No, actually they were bigger.

I have not figured that out when it was -- you don't remember those big -- I'm older than you. Okay, yes, sir, please go on.

MR. GUILMINO:
Yeah, one of the -- I think the board and the public would be very interested in some of the results of the modeling that we have done with regard to traffic flow on the system.

And the system in this case being the I-10/I-12 system as it exists and also the BUMP system when it would come on-line. Because we've heard some numbers about one point something percent on traffic relief on I-10, and I just wanted to make clear what our models are showing.

This is the current flow across the two bridges at Baton Rouge right now, and the 125000 on the I-10 bridge. I've actually seen some numbers I think in DOTD's I-10 study that's going on right now where they have assigned 133,000 on that bridge, coming out of the model. And our guys, our modelers felt that when they ran the model, 125,000 was an accurate number.

And then there's 28,000 on the old bridge. So when you look at the share of traffic across the river on these two bridges, it's about an 82 percent on I-10 and an 18 percent on the old bridge.

Some other important numbers are the traffic that approaches on US 190, on the west side of the river, and I-10 on the west side of the river, how much traffic is on LA 415 and connecting US 190 to I-10? Because what's happening right now is that traffic comes eastbound on US 190. And instead of going across the old bridge and fighting 26 traffic signals on Airline Highway, that traffic takes LA 415 down to I-10 and then crosses on the existing I-10 bridge. And so that's one of the dynamics that's happening out there.

Another very critical traffic number is on I-10 west of the I-10/I-12 split, and that model number right now is 183,000. And then east of the split on I-12 and I-10, 121,000 and 97,000, respectively. And then north of I-12, on Airline Highway, 85,000.

And those are the key numbers that I think are going to be important to understand how traffic is affected. So if we go to -- and that's existing.

If we go to the year 2037, and we didn't do anything, we didn't do the BUMP, and we look at those same numbers, we see that the projection on I-10 is 184,000 and the projection on the old bridge is 36,000. And so that split then grows to 84 percent on I-10, from 82 percent, and only 16 percent on the old bridge.

Looking at these other numbers,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 58</th>
<th>Page 60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. they're growing in the one to one-and-a-half</td>
<td>1. north of I-12, on the BUMP corridor, where we were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. percent range according to the model. If you look</td>
<td>2. seeing very low growth, because they didn't have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. at that growth on 415, again it's people choosing</td>
<td>3. any capacity to grow, couldn't take any more cars,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. to go from 190, down to I-10, to cross I-10,</td>
<td>4. we're seeing a 50,000 vehicle per day increase in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. because the old system on Airline is not</td>
<td>5. that demand right there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. functional.</td>
<td>6. So what does that mean on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tremendous growth at the heavy</td>
<td>7. I-10 bridge, and this is probably the most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. section just west of the I-10/I-12 split, 239,000.</td>
<td>8. important information that one could glean from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. East on I-10 and I-12 continued tremendous growth.</td>
<td>9. looking at these traffic numbers. On the I-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. And these growth numbers that we're seeing on I-10</td>
<td>10. bridge in the year 2037 the volume along that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. system, they're ranging from 70 percent over 20</td>
<td>11. bridge would be 21,000 vehicles per day less than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. years, 22 years, to 31 percent, and actually 47</td>
<td>12. it is today, and that represents a reduction of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. percent on I-10 at the existing Mississippi River Bridge</td>
<td>13. 11.4 percent. The increase on the old bridge would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The one interesting number, is</td>
<td>14. be 19,000 vehicles per day, representing an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. very interesting to me, is on Airline Highway, just</td>
<td>15. increase of about 53 percent. On 415, the dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. north of I-12. The model shows that in the year 2037, without the</td>
<td>16. there is not as many people are diverting down to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. BUMP, you would have 91,000 vehicles per day. That represents</td>
<td>17. I-10, so there's a significant reduction of traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. only 6,000 vehicles or a 7.1 percent growth in traffic at that</td>
<td>18. on that 415 link. On the Airline link, on the BUMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. location.</td>
<td>19. link north of I-12, an additional 54,000 vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. So it's natural to ask, well,</td>
<td>20. per day, 59.3 percent growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. why is traffic growing so fast everywhere else and</td>
<td>21. And what does that mean? When we're</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. it's not growing at that location? And the answer is</td>
<td>22. able to capture those vehicles on the BUMP, as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. is the capacity of Airline Highway is saturated, it</td>
<td>23. opposed to forcing those vehicles basically to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. can't grow anymore. There's just not enough room</td>
<td>24. I-10 and I-12, what benefit does that -- what does</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. to process any more traffic on that arterial roadway system.</td>
<td>25. that get for us? On the section just west of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 59</th>
<th>Page 61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What does that mean when we</td>
<td>1. split, the most heavily congested section, that's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. go to the 2037 projection with the BUMP? So the</td>
<td>2. not going to be able to handle the demand if we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. BUMP is the blue line there, with the new lane</td>
<td>3. don't do something, we have a 28,000 vehicles per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. connecting I-10 to old US 190. And what we see is</td>
<td>4. 4 day reduction, representing 11.7 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. that on the bridges traffic is reduced</td>
<td>5. And then we actually have some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. significantly on I-10 and increased significantly</td>
<td>6. value at, you know, east of the BUMP, on I-10 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. on the old bridge. The traffic split is a much</td>
<td>7. I-12, because people are on the BUMP, distributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. more favorable, 75 percent on I-10 and 25 percent</td>
<td>8. into the neighborhoods, the business areas from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. on the old bridge. The same numbers approaching</td>
<td>9. BUMP, as opposed to being able to -- being forced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. from the west on US 190 and I-10. New numbers</td>
<td>10. to do that from I-10 and I-12 system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. transferring from I-10 over to the BUMP corridor.</td>
<td>11. So when you look at that as a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. But one of the interesting</td>
<td>12. whole, you can see the value of unloading the I-10,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. things here is the model is saying that right now</td>
<td>13. Mississippi River Bridge, you can see the value of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. the people that come on 190 and then take 415 down</td>
<td>14. relieving the I-10 system in East Baton Rouge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. to I-10 to go across, that number is going to be</td>
<td>15. Parish, and then that third thing that I was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. reduced dramatically. Because they're going to</td>
<td>16. saying, using that -- the extra car count on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. stay on 190, go across the old bridge, because when</td>
<td>17. Airline Highway, the BUMP, to revitalize that older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. they get to the east side of the river they have a</td>
<td>18. part of Baton Rouge, that needs a stimulus and to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. functional system, an interstate-style system to</td>
<td>19. get the trend line moving back in the right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. receive and process that traffic.</td>
<td>20. direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. East of I-10/I-12, 211,000, out</td>
<td>21. One thing that's interesting to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. West of I-10/I-12, 211,000, out</td>
<td>22. me is when our modeler ran that and he reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. east 142 and 133,000. And then very importantly,</td>
<td>23. those numbers out, there's a general consensus with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. the modeling that is being done on the I-10</td>
<td>24. the modeling that is being done on the I-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Mississippi -- the I-10 widening project that's</td>
<td>25. Mississippi -- the I-10 widening project that's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 under study right now, in Baton Rouge, on the east
2 bank and on the west bank. And this chart shows
3 that if you just build a new bridge south of I-10,
4 you do some good. If you just build a BUMP, you do
5 some good. But what you really need is those
6 things working together to have the most good.
7 And so this one last thing I
8 wanted to show regarding traffic is if you think of
9 what our needs are as a system, then the first
10 piece in that system can be the BUMP from I-10 and
11 West Baton Rouge Parish, onto US 190, across the
12 old bridge, and back to I-12 and south of I-12.
13 The second piece, as the BUMP
14 is going, manageably financed with tolls, the west
15 side expressway and the new bridge south of I-10,
16 we can work together and craft a finance plan with
17 new public funding revenues to go along, perhaps,
18 with toll revenues that could be generated on those
19 facilities.
20 And so with that, that's all
21 the traffic I had. But I did think it important to
22 clarify the one point something percent reduction
23 in traffic on I-10. If you look at the I-10
24 bridge, it's actually 11 percent in our analysis.
25 I've seen some that say 10 percent. If you look at

1 the reduction at the I-10/I-12 split, the most
2 heavily traveled section, our analysis says it's 12
3 or 13 percent. I've seen some analyses that have
4 it up the 18 percent.
5 And so with that --
6 MR. WOLSFELD:
7 Conclusions: Our view --
8 question?
9 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
10 She does. Okay. Yes, ma'am,
11 Mandi.
12 REPRESENTATIVE MITCHELL:
13 Thank you, Madam Chairman. I
14 just want to make sure that I'm understanding these
15 percentages from an apples-to-apples perspective.
16 HNTB's number is showing a projection of a
17 diversion of only 1.9 percent. I'm not sure of the
18 timing of that, but your projection is showing in
19 year 2037 an 11 percent reduction.
20 So can you put those diversion
21 percentages into an apples-to-apples so that we
22 know what time frame we're looking at, and are we
23 looking at some of the same assumptions that went
24 into the analysis?
25 MR. SCHMIDT:

1 Yeah, I will speak to that, and
2 then HNTB may want to speak to that as well.
3 Our time frame is the year
4 2037, which is the out year of the model. And what
5 we did was look at the traffic on the I-10,
6 Mississippi River Bridge if you didn't have the
7 BUMP, which the model reports out, and then the
8 traffic on the I-10, Mississippi River Bridge if
9 you did have the BUMP, which the model reports
10 out.
11 I have heard about one point
12 something percent relief of traffic on I-10, but I
13 did not see that in the HNTB literature that was
14 produced. I don't know where that number came
15 from. Believe me, when I heard it, I grilled and
16 questioned our modelers very closely and
17 carefully. And as we talked through it, again we
18 compared the outputs that we're getting very
19 favorably to some of the results that we're seeing
20 from other modeling efforts that are ongoing in the
21 region regarding combinations of projects that
22 might be done. If you just did the new bridge
23 south of I-10, if you just did the BUMP, if you
24 combined those projects together.
25 So I'm not sure, again, what

1 the one point something percent is or where that is
2 published, I don't know.
3 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
4 Okay. We'll have HNTB come up
5 and I have a -- Mandi, go ahead and -- you good?
6 Okay.
7 And she knows how to turn off
8 her button. I have a couple of questions before he
9 starts.
10 Okay. So I know a big factor
11 in a lot of this, we've had so many issues over the
12 years, environmental. Where is that in the
13 process?
14 MR. SCHMIDT:
15 Well, in our vision for the
16 project, as we expressed in the public part of our
17 proposal, we noted that the construction of the
18 road itself, on the east side of the river, would
19 in almost all cases fit within the existing
20 right-of-way, either 200 feet or 300 feet of
21 right-of-way.
22 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
23 But we're going to have to
24 conduct an environmental study --
25 MR. SCHMIDT:
1  That's correct, there would --
2  REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
3      -- federally-mandated.
4  MR. SCHMIDT:
5      Yeah, but -- yeah, that's
6      correct, it's federally-mandated.
7      But we noted that there's -- a
8      lot of the hurdles that you normally face in
9      conducting an environmental assessment like that,
10     those are not present on this facility.
11  REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
12      Okay. Who would be the person
13      to pick up that part of it? Would that be you all,
14      would it be the DOTD?
15  MR. WOLSFELD:
16      It needs to be a third party.
17      I mean, we have a vested interest in the project,
18      so we can't do the environmental --
19  REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
20      Well, I know at one point you
21      could, at one point in time, but now you cannot.
22  MR. WOLSFELD:
23      Even if there was -- there's
24      actually been some cases recently where state DOTs
25      have allowed the proponent to do the environmental

document. Our view would be as projects are tough
enough, we don't need --

2  REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
4      Well, federal regulations are
5      now a lot more stricture on our monies.
6      Okay, yes, sir. Go ahead,
7      please, HNTB.
8  MR. GUILMINO:
9      Yeah, thanks. There's three
10     different reports circulating around with different
11     numbers, so I definitely understand the confusion
12     for everyone up here.
13     We independently came up and we
14     based our modeling on the Baton Rouge traffic
15     demand modeling. And our numbers came out that
16     it's only a few percentage points are actually
17     being deferred from I-10 to use the facility.
18     After we came up with our
19     analysis, this I-10 study here, right, they said
20     1.9 percent is their number, so that was a second
21     piece. And I believe there's a third study from
22     the MPO that Stantec did that also was right around
23     two percent. So my report didn't specifically say
24     it, but anecdotally, our modelers have told us it
25     was only going to be a few percentage points.

1  MR. WOLSFELD:
2      May I ask a follow-up
3      question?
4      Is that the total reduction in
5      volume or just the reduction from I-10 to I-10?
6  MR. GUILMINO:
7      It's folks diverting from I-10
8      as a bypass. Right, most of our traffic --
9  MR. WOLSFELD:
10     There's the difference. We see
11     more traffic coming from I-12 to I-10 diverting
12     than I-10 to I-10.
13  MR. GUILMINO:
14     When we looked at it, though,
15     it was at the bridge. So either way, where they're
16     coming from doesn't matter. It's the total
17     movement across the bridge.
18     And if I could comment one
19     other thing. I don't totally disagree with a lot
20     of your T&R assumptions that you put forward, but a
21     lot of those were aggressive. Right? When you
22     look at a facility, I think there was 12 points.
23     They chose to look at six, which means roughly we
24     agreed with six. Then they took a more aggressive
25     view of potentially some of these six.

1  We don't deny that the private
2  sector eventually could get to a lot of those
3  points. But for our analysis, where we're at in
4  the standpoint, you know, this is Baton Rouge.
5  There's no tolling here. There's free route
6  directly next to it. It's hard to compare it to
7  high employment, high growth areas in Texas and
8  other places.

9      So I at least wanted to say
10     while not wildly wrong, by any means, you know, you
11     could have an investment group report where two
12     folks would bicker about some of the assumptions,
13     but a lot of those were on the aggressive side and
14     we chose to stay more in the middle.
15  REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
16      Okay. Could I have someone
17      from DOTD talk about the environmental a little
18      bit? Jeff, that would be you?
19      It's a big decision today and I
20      need more information because -- we all need more
21      information to make sure that whatever we decide,
22      they have it.
23      So I would ask you about
24      environmental, cost to environmental, to DOTD and
25      exactly how long of a process is that?
Mr. Burst:
Well, until the project is
fully vetted and decided, these are just
approximate estimates, but they're right -- well,
what they did testify to earlier, it would be done
by a third party at the expense of the Department.

Representative St. Germain:
Okay.

Mr. Burst:
And we are looking at no less
than two years of an analysis to go through the
federal and legal process. And we were looking at
a cost no less than approximately a million
dollars.

Representative St. Germain:
Okay. And it's not the length
of time it takes that bothers me, I mean that's a
natural thing that it has to go through, but it's
just more for the panel to understand.

Any other questions? Senator
Adley.

Senator Adley:
The part that has concerned me
the most as I've looked at the project as the BUMP
carries itself back through the city again, for all
practical purposes, you've talked a great deal
about the economic growth that would occur in Baton
Rouge, and I can clearly see that. What concerns
me the most is that what's created the problem
in Baton Rouge, it appears to me, more than
anything else, is all of the traffic crossing the
bridge into the city, that's creating this
bottleneck coming into Baton Rouge.

In finding a way to eliminate
that traffic, to get it as quickly as you can back
around to 10 or 12, seems to be the logical thing
to do. Your argument for the BUMP, talking about
the economic development, makes sense to me, but it
makes more sense to me from a Baton Rouge
perspective than possibly a state perspective.

So I'm curious, what
conversations have you all had with the City of Baton
Rouge in their participation in your project?

Mr. Schmidt:
That's a great question.
One of the things on a project
of this magnitude -- and there's a lot of interest
groups, believe me, you know, in the community.
But if I'm just a traffic engineer and I look at
this strictly from what are the traffic benefits to
people passing through the region, using the
Airline Highway corridor, if I just look at it from
that perspective, then if I live in that part of
Airline Highway corridor, I ask what's in it for
me, you know, what good does it do me to facilitate
all of this increased traffic through my
neighborhood.

So we thought about that very
carefully and we said, well, what's in it for me is
that this is a chance for a stimulus to be
provided, for those neighborhoods to be
redeveloped. Because right now they're --

Senator Adley:
And I got that. Have you
talked to the City, has the City of Baton Rouge,
have you visited with them at all about their
participation?

Mr. Schmidt:
I have visited with the City,
early on in the visioning process for this
project. The City may speak publicly here
shortly.

But in addition to that, I
visited with community groups, up and down the
corridor, with legislators who represent that part

of the corridor. And one of the things I find very
interesting and very unusual on this project is
that if you go from 20 miles, from one end to the
other, on the west side of the river you have a
rural environment, with those legislators. On the
east side of the river, you pass through the older
part of the corridor, that's a little bit
depressed. And on the south end of the corridor,
you have a very affluent area, and legislators
representing each of those three areas. Those
legislators have banded together, 30 strong, and
made this project their number one capital outlay
request for planning seed money for the last three
14 years. And so it's unusual that you find such a
diverse group that would band together to do that.

Senator Adley:
Well, the fact that they have
come together to get those dollars to plan the
project, there's clearly a difference at this stage
of the game from what we heard early on between the
project and this proposal. There is a difference.

And these guys, men and women, that got that money
-- I mean, there's limited amount of dollars to
finish this study of this particular project.

So I think it's going to be
1. difficult for the Department to sit down and say, 
2. look, I'm going to do a deal with you and I'm going 
3. to start spending my money, working on that deal, 
4. then I'm going to open it back up to the public 
5. again because they're going to run out of money. 
6. And these guys that work for that money, they not 
7. going to get there. They're not. Unless they move 
8. forward just to evaluate the project. There is a 
9. difference. 
10. I just wanted to say as one who 
11. lives outside of Baton Rouge, but who has lived in 
12. it now for almost 40 years, dang near all year 
13. long, every year, it always astounded me that all 
14. the traffic flow -- the problem that got created is 
15. you moved everything into the city, everything. 
16. Everything comes from that bridge into the city. 
17. And it's created a horrible mess. 
18. And I point out to you that 
19. Airlane was the -- at one point, the road. It was 
20. it before the interstate. And then we ran into a 
21. problem, and they built the interstate. Now we got 
22. another problem. 
23. But until you get around that, 
24. you're never going to move that interstate 
25. traffic. You're not. I mean, you can move some
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1. inner city traffic. And that's why I'm very 
2. interested to find out what the City proposes what 
3. their part in this might be. Thank you. 
4. REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN: 
5. You're welcome. 
6. And I absolutely never speak 
7. for the entire East Baton Rouge area delegation, 
8. but we have promoted this project. This project is 
9. very needed and very wanted. 
10. The problem is that we have a 
11. list of those that make that big puzzle piece that 
12. I talk about all the time, and we have to make sure 
13. they all fit together. And this is a vital piece, 
14. bottom line. But the amount of money that we need 
15. to be necessary to continue going forward may or 
16. may not be enough. 
17. I don't have that answer. 
18. That's an answer I hope to get from somebody going 
19. forward. But this has -- this is strictly just 
20. about a very new, first-time process we're going 
21. through right now. And we want to make sure that 
22. the future of the legislature has in its hand the 
23. most strategic, best way to handle the traffic, 
24. whatever -- whatever way we set that forward. I'm 
25. not smart enough to say which goes first. That's
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1. why we have Madam Secretary and those engineers. 
2. But it is definitely the 
3. project is needed. We have some -- I think, 
4. personally, we have some things that we have to 
5. take care of, like the old bridge, and that's not 
6. -- with an engineering degree, that's just 
7. knowing that that bridge has its problems today, 
8. with traffic. 
9. If I try to diversify my 
10. driving habits and go through 190 at the same time 
11. in the morning that I know I cannot get over the 
12. bridge, it's stopped, right now, on both sides. 
13. And so most of the time I just tell them I will be 
14. late. Or don't set it for 8 o'clock, because I can 
15. tell you now I'll be there for 7:00 or 9:00 but not 
16. 8:00. 
17. So, all right, I think that's 
18. all the questions that we have. So appreciate -- 
19. MR. SCHMIDT: 
20. Okay. 
21. REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN: 
22. You're more than welcome to 
23. close. If you have anything you want to add, 
24. please. 
25. MR. WOLFSFELD:
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1. Well, to me, the point here is 
2. that your legislation set up a process to deal with 
3. some of this uncertainty that you have, with a 
4. pre-development agreement and then a comprehensive 
5. development agreement and then financial close, so 
6. there are a series of offerings. 
7. And the only way you're going 
8. to find out what the private sector would 
9. specifically propose to participate financially in 
10. the next stage of the effort is to go out with 
11. competing proposals. It's no secret, we did not 
12. put everything we propose to do in our initial 
13. proposal, because we knew -- we expected that there 
14. would be competing proposals, and we, like everyone 
15. else, will have a chance to update our proposal. 
16. We felt we put enough in the proposal that said 
17. this is a good project, it makes sense, and it has 
18. a reasonable chance of paying for itself with 
19. tolls. 
20. So we, obviously, would hope 
21. you would proceed with soliciting competing 
22. proposals. 
23. REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN: 
24. And we appreciate all of your 
25. time.
MR. SCHMIDT:
And I would just say one more thing, Madam Chair.
When we -- you know, this has not been used in Louisiana before, the --

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
Correct.

MR. SCHMIDT:
-- PPP legislation. So when I started talking to our senior executives about the opportunity of the project, to meet a need for Baton Rouge and to be a good business proposition for AECOM, we pulled out the legislation. That's what we did. And the first thing we read in there is that it's the intent of this legislation to stimulate private investment in Louisiana's highway system, because traditional funds just cannot keep up with the need.

And so I would always request that the board consider that intent of the legislation in its deliberations.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
And trust me, if we can get some stimulation of money into transportation, I'd be happy to be a consultant for free, if we could get some of this moving, which they probably wouldn't hire me, anyway.

MR. SCHMIDT:
Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
Okay, Representative Morris, you have a question for the gentlemen.

REPRESENTATIVE MORRIS:
Well, I'm not sure. Madam Chairman, I was wondering on the competing proposals, when are we going to get into the cost factor of that, as to where we're at, what money we have and what that's going to cost and where we're going to move? I need to get some type of outline on that. Are we going to get to that?

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
Jeff, you want to come up and give that now and then we'll have the elected officials to speak afterwards.

MR. BURST:
If it was decided to move forward and advertise for competing proposals, it is estimated that the procurement process to do so in evaluations of those proposals, would be in the range of approximately $750,000. What we have left confinement. Now, we'd have to move into another year to get more money. We would have to make some type of provision for the 250,000, as I appreciate it, which would take a vote of the legislature, right?

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE MORRIS:
Which would be not in this year's budget, but in next year. How long --

MR. BURST:
That's right, it would not be until the next year's budget, that it could possibly have a conversion of other moneys.

REPRESENTATIVE MORRIS:
So I'm not sure that it would happen with the 30 member strong delegation that we have, but it is a possibility that we may not come up with the 250,000 that we're lacking then.

Okay, thank you, Madam Chair.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
Thank you.

Representative Steve Carter, the man who says I'm taking his chair today and -- but you have some broken lights on this darn
1 thing.

2 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER:
3 I hope we're not here till 1:30
4 a.m.
5 Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm
6 Steve Carter, Chairman of the Capital Regional
7 Legislative Delegation. It has been mentioned --
8 this has been discussed with our delegation with 30
9 plus members strong, and we prioritize our
10 projects, and this has been our top priority for a
11 number of years.
12 And let me just say this. I
13 listened today and I applaud all of y'all and I
14 appreciate very much your time and what you do, but
15 here's what's frustrating. We allocated, I think
16 it was originally, I'm not sure of my numbers,
17 maybe $3 million. It got pushed down to --

18 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
19 One million.
20 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER:
21 -- 1.25, I think.
22 But here's my point. We've got
23 to do something. And here I am listening that
24 we're going to study, we need more money to study,
25 we need money for environmental. And we can

26 continue to study and we can continue to do
27 environmental, and it gets worse and worse and
28 worse.
29 So my question is: How do we
30 get off dead center? Senator Adley, you're good at
31 getting people off dead center. You've been an
32 extremely good senator and found ways to make
33 things happen. So I'm pleading with you. I mean,
34 we're in trouble.
35 If I'm Adam Knapp, chairman of
36 the -- with economic development and growth, and
37 what have you, with the chamber here, I don't see
38 how he gets any business to come here. We're
39 talking about over on your side --

40 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
41 We're talking about the whole
42 region.
43 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER:
44 And not only are we talking
45 about the whole region, but we're talking about Dow
46 not wanting to expand because you can't get the
47 work. Help.

48 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
49 Welcome.
50 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER:
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1 We need help.
2 And so my point in saying what
3 I'm saying is we got 1.25 and we've already spent,
4 whatever it is, three-quarters of a million
5 studying. And we're getting ready to study again,
6 and we need more money to study. This is a sick
7 process.

8 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
9 Yes, sir.
10 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER:
11 Every person and every citizen
12 is struggling. So I'm preaching to the choir, I
13 know that, but my point is that we got to move
14 forward. We can't not move forward with this
15 project.
16 We have a 19-point plan of which
17 we're going to prioritize within the region. We've
18 got everybody on board to do it. And this is one
19 of the top priorities. And if we continue to sit
20 back with the other 18 and say we need money to
21 study, you know the answer.
22 So I hate to preach to the
23 choir, because I know y'all are trying, but some
24 way, some how, Sherrill, I'm pleading, we've got to
25 find some way to solve the problem. I know you had
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1 a study -- we had a meeting on expanding coming off
2 the bridge. We're studying? We know the answer.
3 So again, please help us. We
4 need this project to move forward. I appreciate
5 very much your time and I'm sorry I got on a
6 soapbox.

7 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
8 It's okay because I understand
9 that you understand our frustration, and myself,
10 personally, because I know it --

11 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER:
12 I know it.

13 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
14 The problem is that even the
15 going forward has the -- has what -- or asks what
16 we don't have. That doesn't mean I don't want it
17 to go forward. The project is so essential in the
18 growth of Baton Rouge and the help of the traffic
19 congestion. But the end result is and hopefully --
20 and I'm going to go on my soapbox for a second --
21 Amendment 1 and 2 pass to be able to give us some
22 of that money that wouldn't go into the fund till
23 -- I'm not sure -- when is the effective date?

24 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER:
25 Soon.
REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:

Yeah. Well, it's much sooner than we have without them.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER:

Right.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:

So the bottom line is to have money available to do those studies as many as you and I and several of the East Baton Rouge delegation voted to try to get that pay-as-you-go, one percent tax on the normal, everyday, what we pay now, I guess is the best way to say that. And making this short and sweet, I just absolutely think that why we're stuck in this problem is because the general public doesn't trust us, the members worrying, an election year. But those who voted for it can make sure they tell their individual constituents that you were trying to pay as you go. You weren't trying to stick the state or anyone else with those moneys being owed. We want to pay as we go. And all of those 18 projects were great, so I'm looking to y'all to lead that charge next year. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER:

We will. And part of our problem, to be honest with you is, you look at Senator Adley and you look at Senator Morris, they don't have one, they don't have two, they have three loops around because they planned way ahead. We are behind the time, and I don't want to continue to be in the state legislature and say, well, you're behind the time again.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:

Trust me.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER:

Okay. Thank you very much.

SECRETARY LEBAS:

Secretary LeBas, you wanted to speak to Representative Carter?

SECRETARY LEBAS:

Oh, Representative Carter, I just want to say, you know, I understand your frustration. I live in Baton Rouge and drive the roads every day, just like you and the other people in this area. So we at DOTD, as you know, we do have the feasibility study underway for the I-10, and we did have the public meeting. We're going to move forward with that effort. Of course, construction money will need to be identified. And then as well a new Mississippi River Bridge crossing, we have that feasibility study going on. And, you know, we want to make sure that we're using -- that we're looking at data to see what is the best solution for this region. And we have numbers, we presented that at the 1-10 meeting. So we believe that we are getting a good handle, and you saw some of those traffic numbers today. And so we are moving forward with those. Again, construction money will need to be identified.

But, you know, just to be clear, even with a PPP, you still have processes that you must go through, such as finishing or completing a feasibility study, doing the economic analysis for the tolls, doing the need for process, the environmental process. Just because you do a PPP, doesn't mean that you get to -- that you don't do those steps. Those steps are still required. So I just want to clear that up, but do understand your frustration. And I think all of these projects, if you look at the data again, if you look at the data, it all -- they all work together. So there's not just one solution. And we know that, and so we just need to continue working together to do what's best for the area to improve the traffic. But I'm optimistic that we are going to come up and be able to get a project complete and move forward with at least one or two or three of these projects. We just need to keep moving on it.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER:

I'd like to be a little bit like Nike. No more feasibility, just do it.

SECRETARY LEBAS:

I'm with you. Wish I could.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:

Find me some money.

Senator Adley.

SENIOR ADLEY:

I might say the good news from Nike is they build a pair of tennis shoes for $3 and sell them for 100 bucks, it's easy for them to do it. It's not so easy for us to do it. I wanted to just make it clear for everybody to understand. By law, by law, this initial study of this P3 is required by law. That law is passed by the legislature. That's what
1. we've had to do. Like it or not, that's the
2. process we've had to go through.
3. P3 is going to be an important
4. part of the future, in Louisiana and around the
5. country before it's over with. But you're going to
6. have to get through that initial one. And that's
7. what we're going through. And you have to follow
8. the law to get there. We don't have much choice in
9. that. And that's what the original study has
10. done.
11. Your decision today is simply
12. this: Are you going to actually move forward,
13. saying you think this project makes some sense and
14. finish the complete study, or you going to spend
15. your money to start negotiation back and forth with
16. one firm, and then open it up again to do the same
17. thing again. You're going to get the bigger bang
18. for your buck, in my opinion, Madam Chairman -- or
19. Chair Lady, if you move forward and, Steve, get it
20. over with, get the thing behind us, so that you can
21. ultimately move forward.
22. Now, I do want to respond to
23. what you said about Shreveport and Bossier. Jim
24. and I are lucky. We do have some loops up there.
25. We don't have all that we would like to have, but
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| 1. we have loops. But we did not build -- we very
2. carefully tried to get around all of those
3. populated areas so that we didn't create that jam
4. in the city.
5. And that's why I asked the
6. question: What role does the City of Baton Rouge
7. want to play in this project in the future?
8. Because I think it's going to fall upon them as
9. much as it is the State to play some role in this
10. one, because this one is not going to solve all
11. your problems. It's not. It's going to get part
12. of it, but it ain't going to get all of it.

**REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:**

13. We have someone here from the
14. City of Baton Rouge, if you'd like to hear him
15. speak now?
16. 
17. **SENIOR ADLEY:**
18. Yep.
19. 
20. **REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:**
21. William Daniel, would you come
22. to the table. Ex-legislator understands the whole
23. darn thing -- former. I'm going to be an ex.

**MR. DANIEL:**

24. I wouldn't be an X if I
25. understood it as well as you said, Madam Chair.
MR. DANIEL:

-- believe me, I don't want to sound like that. However, the Mayor has to prioritize, just as we did in the Green Light Program, to try to get some connectivity within the surface streets of Baton Rouge. He's looking at:

How do I get the traffic moving across the bridge?

Because you're right, we've had meetings with industry, where they're saying we can't afford to expand, because the traffic is so horrendous going back and forth across the bridge, we're not going to be able to hire anybody.

And so that's our first priority is to fix that problem. And I think that, you know, DOTD has come forward with some proposals that I think make a lot of sense in going forward with that. So that's where our priority is,

Senator.

SENATOR SMITH:

Okay. Because, I mean, this is certainly a worthwhile project, but we have multiple worthwhile projects. And trying to get the best bang with the limited knowledge that we have, so wanted to see where the relationship may be with some --

MR. DANIEL:

We have way too many worthwhile projects we need to do.

SENATOR SMITH:

Understood. Thank you.

Mr. It's Senator Smith?

SENATOR SMITH:

Yes.

Mr. It's Senator Smith.

Thank you, William.

All right, Mr. Ken Perret. I'm just going in the order they gave them to me.

Senator Rick Ward, did you fill out a little card? Yes, sir.

My senator, I'm extremely -- would have a problem if -- since I'm leaving, if I don't make him happy.

MR. PERRET:

Chairman and Members of the Committee, my name is Ken Perret. I'm the president of Louisiana Good Roads and Transportation Association, former DOTD assistant secretary, former division administrator of the Federal Highway Administration.

I had some comments today because I've heard the whole presentation, and this is the first time I've seen the analysis that was provided as far as the feasibility. And I think there's been some great points made about, you know, getting the best project we can, and especially taking initiative for implementing a PPP project. And I think that's the key thing that the committee needs to think about, is that we hear a lot about that and the citizens ask about that all the time: Well, why can't we have low tolls? Why can't we get outside investment to come in and help us with our situation?

Here's a great opportunity to try something, try something new, try something a little different. And I was impressed by the one analysis I think showed that we -- the tolls itself could pay for about 68 percent of the project. Now, that's pretty good, really, as far as taking care of the total cost of the project. Because when I was with the government, the best we could do was come up with about 50 percent on some of the projects that we looked at, the 1-49 and some of the other possible projects. So 68 percent funding...
1. without any state -- without any substantial state investment other than the preliminary work is pretty good.
2. And I think maybe with some value engineering and other techniques that the proposals can come up with and close that gap, where maybe -- and with the projection of increased tolling, maybe can get to the situation where the tolls will actually pay for the total project.
3. So I think this project is a very worthy project. And I have to say I agree with William Daniel about the I-10 corridor, but I can tell you when I was with the department, back when I started in the year 2000, we were about this close to having a solution and we were pretty close to finishing the environmental process, 15 years ago. And now we're back not even to the environmental process.
4. So to expect something to be done on I-10 here in Baton Rouge coming up the bridge is a pipe dream as far as the next three or four years. We're talking something probably in a ten-year-time frame before anything is done in the I-10 corridor, because of the price is going out of the roof, you know, and we're still in the pre-need process.
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1 proposal that you're going to accept, you know, as a final proposal.
2 So I think, again, my recommendation is for y'all to proceed. Let's try something new. Let's try this as a 3P project and get something going for Baton Rouge that I probably will see completed before too long, because I can't wait another 25 years. I probably won't be able to drive on it, but --
3 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
4 I rented a wheelchair for the bridge crossing the river, so I'm --
5 MR. PERRET:
6 There you go. So I'm glad to answer any questions as far as, you know -- but as far as Good Roads, we certainly do know that we need additional revenues. But if y'all listen to the governor -- gubernatorial candidates last night on TV, all three of them said, no, we're not going to raise any additional revenues. We're going to do smoking mirrors and try to move funds around, you know, before -- we got to restore some trust in the trust fund before we ever try to get additional revenues. So don't anticipate -- we're going to press them and keep asking him to consider additional revenues, but if you heard the debate last night, they said no.
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1 So we need to pass Amendments No. 1 and 2, so we can get some relief, but then we got to really work with the -- whoever wins the gubernatorial race to show them that we do need additional revenues.
2 Thank you.
3 REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:
4 Thank you. They don't want me on their doorstep as just Karen St. Germain. It would be worse than being state rep.
5 Okay, Mr. Coleman Brown.
6 MR. BROWN:
7 Thank you, Committee Members.
8 I'm Coleman Brown. Senator Adley is hopefully going to come back in a few seconds.
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1 So I think my recommendation to the committee is to keep the process going, to go ahead and solicit for competing proposals with the idea of trying to close that 68 percent gap to something that can be financed totally with tolls.
2 And, you know, you going to have private companies competing against each other, so they get pretty innovative when they have to put the pencil to the paper and come up with a
which extends from Airline Highway, extended down basically to Acadian Thruway. That was about 20, 25 years ago. We have folded into MidCity Merchants, which also extends from Airline Highway and Florida Boulevard. It's a group of roughly 130 merchants in the Government Street/Florida Boulevard area. It sounds like most of you know those streets and are familiar with them.

We have been very appreciative of the recent work by the highway department, re-paving Florida Boulevard. It's about an 8 or $9 million job. It was very successful. They coordinated it with our merchants. The highway department staff was fabulous, a great contractor that they used. The road is really good. That was about two or three years ago. We're very, very appreciative of that improvement.

It has fostered new growth of new businesses on Florida. It's helped Airline Highway. There have been some transitions with Vivid Printing and Vivid Ink.

I'm the chairman of the development committee for MidCity Merchants. We meet monthly. The MPO director and assistant director, the Capital Regional Planning Commission attends our meetings monthly, have been doing so for the last eight or nine months. A lot of our representatives, Alfred Williams -- like Alfred Williams attended our meetings every other month.

Denise Marcelle, Donna Collins-Lewis, Tara Wicker and Ryan Heck, those four council people in Baton Rouge attend our meetings almost monthly. We have Ingolf Partenheimer, our traffic engineer that attends our meetings.

I happen to also be friends with and represent in this conversation Don's Seafood, McClain's Trailer, and AAA Paint & Body Shop, Bobby Lewis. All of those are opposed to making Airline Highway basically a toll road with service roads. We don't know any business that is for service roads. In fact, several of the people that we know at the highway department have all pointed out that the highway department themselves basically do not like service roads as far as traffic ingress and egress.

We are extremely happy with the project that occurred about seven years ago with the highway department six lane Airline Highway, from Florida Boulevard to Cedarcrest. That project's cost was a basic price of about $13-and-a-half million. Barber Brothers did that work. None of our friends and neighbors on Airline Highway complained at all. That work was held with minimal interruption to those businesses. The highway department did that project in-house in terms of design. There were no outside engineers that did the work. That road had the distinction of being a level of service "F" for almost -- over 30 years. It was the longest running level of service "F," to my knowledge, anywhere in the country, when it was finally widened for $13-and-a-half million.

Now, the highway department also spent about $2-and-a-half million, upgrading the lights, from Florida Boulevard to Cedarcrest. It went from a level of service "F" to a level of service "B" and has stayed pretty much a level of service "B" ever since.

We are so grateful. We think that that money spent is the best money that the State of Louisiana has -- or the City of Baton Rouge has ever done to relieve this chaos, which has been the parking lot of Airline Highway.

So we think and know from talking to other engineers, contractors who've done this work in the past, we feel very confident that you can simply widen Airline Highway, from the old bridge, at a cost of about $25, $26 million to Florida Boulevard, $25 to $26 million, somewhere in there, and then you can widen it past where we've done it at Cedarcrest -- Senator Adley, I'm glad you returned -- I think for under $60 million, you can get Baton Rouge connected with six lanes, which as all of you know, if you do six lanes, as opposed to four lanes, the four lanes -- the four lanes that were built in 1932 by Huey Long are basically the same road that's out there today, that we struggle with. So from -- when you go from four lanes to six lanes, you double the capacity of the road.

Now grant it, we've got these lights that Robert and others have talked about, 24, 25 lights, but those are being handled by the city of Baton Rouge's traffic department now, a lot of them, especially the ones on the road that the State has done such a beautiful job of widening four lanes to six lanes from Florida to Cedarcrest.

So our hope is that some of the lights, or superfluous lights, if they are, can be synchronized the way the city of Baton Rouge is...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 106</th>
<th>Page 108</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>handling them now with Mr. Partenheimer's office.</td>
<td>would only occur every two months that we would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's a fabulous thing that he's done on Florida</td>
<td>have a meeting. And Robert made his pitch to our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard from downtown to Denham Springs, he's</td>
<td>committee about four years ago, three or four years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordinating those lights now. And he's also</td>
<td>ago, at the chamber transportation committee. And</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordinating these other lights on Airline</td>
<td>it was a good pitch, but I really didn't think it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway.</td>
<td>would get to this day that I'd be talking to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So I don't mean to take up too much time, but I see you nodding your head like you</td>
<td>about it, because we have so many other problems in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>want me to go home so -- but I could talk about</td>
<td>Baton Rouge. The biggest problem that ever came</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge and Baton Rouge traffic extensively.</td>
<td>out of our Baton Rouge chamber transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:</strong></td>
<td>committee was, as Senator Adley said, the old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, sir. It's a Cajun habit.</td>
<td>bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I nod my head, everything. It doesn't mean yes or</td>
<td>The old bridge -- around 1998 or 1999 -- I didn't know Governor Foster too well,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no.</td>
<td>maybe met him once or twice. I wrote a letter to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. BROWN:</strong></td>
<td>the DOTD secretary at the time -- it was a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let's talk about some excitement on the old bridge, because I know that's</td>
<td>gentleman, I can't remember his name -- about '98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Adley's problem. I'm glad he's with us as</td>
<td>or '99. I said: Dear, sir, please remove the one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much as he is. Forty years is a long time for him</td>
<td>lane eastbound -- if you're coming from Lafayette,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be going through our mess. But we're delighted</td>
<td>you're eastbound, please remove the one painted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with -- in Baton Rouge we have a new MPO director</td>
<td>lane that you have and just go -- there's plenty of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and capital region planning director, Jamie Setze --</td>
<td>room there to go to two lanes. So now you have two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:</strong></td>
<td>lanes and he -- they got out there two days later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You might want to get down to</td>
<td>I had on their hold, Linda Lightfoot, she's a friend of mine, used to be the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what -- I know he kind of missed part of your</td>
<td>editor of the newspaper, and I said, hold, Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. BROWN:</strong></td>
<td>Foster, for three days. Two days later the highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, okay.</td>
<td>department was out there sandblasting up those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:</strong></td>
<td>lines --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- about the project itself.</td>
<td><strong>REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. BROWN:</strong></td>
<td>Look, I appreciate -- you don't even imagine how much I appreciate all of your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not going to repeat</td>
<td>knowledge. The problem is we really need to stick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myself.</td>
<td>to this subject matter because --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:</strong></td>
<td><strong>MR. BROWN:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'd love for you to just go over what you really think about the project</td>
<td>Oh, I'm sticking to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itself.</td>
<td><strong>REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR. BROWN:</strong></td>
<td>No, sir, we need to stick to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In essence, Airline Highway can be solved for $60 million, Airline Highway. But</td>
<td>the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let's talk about Baton Rouge too, to make it real exciting.</td>
<td><strong>MR. BROWN:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I told you for $130 million, which is something that's very doable, and I think</td>
<td>All right. Well, you can solve that for $2 million. I thought it would be $2.8 million, you'd put another ramp -- let's solve everything -- I just got a few minutes to solve all of Baton Rouge's problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William, when he listens to me for a few minutes, will agree with a lot of these solutions. I served on the chamber of transportation -- Chamber of Commerce, Transportation Committee for about ten years. I probably missed three meetings because it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solve that bridge thing, another 500,000 you can do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the lighting and the -- what do you call it -- the  
stripes and the couple of signs and things like  
that. I've talked that over with Dennis Decker.  
He's not here today. I don't think he's here  
today. But he's a very competent person with the  
highway department. He's in charge of this region,  
I believe.  

So I'm here to work with you.  
Our MidCity Merchants people are here to work with  
you. We agree with everything that's basically  
been said today by William Daniel and others on the  
committee.  

**REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:**  
As a person who grew up and  
only knew how to drive Florida Boulevard and  
Airline, I totally understand.  

**MR. BROWN:**  
Thank you, ma'am.  

**REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:**  
Thank you.  

Okay, Senator Ward.  

**SENIOR WARD:**  
Thank you, Madam Chair. I  
appreciate y'all giving me a few minutes of your  
time. You know, I am part of the Baton Rouge  
region. I live in West Baton Rouge and I see every  
day -- not only do I see every day the traffic  
problem that we face, I sit it in almost every day,  
as my office sits on LA 1.  
So it is absolutely a regional  
problem. It's getting to the point where it's  
starting to affect how businesses look at the  
region. I've had many conversations with Dow and  
some of the plants that are on the west side of the  
river. And not only are they having trouble  

attracting people to come work, they're actually  
having people leave. You know, when you hire an  
engineer and you spend six months training them,  
and then three months after you're done training  
them, they leave and go somewhere else because they  
don't have to deal with the traffic. Not only do  
they lose the employee, they lose the money that  
they invested in that person.  

So, you know, I know this is  
only one piece of the puzzle. I know there was  
some mention that it may only move two percent of  
the traffic off I-10. But I think as we move  
forward, as long as we continue to look at the  
traffic problem regionally, I think it's certainly  
a piece of the puzzle.  

**I know the best case scenario  
and the one that seems to move the most traffic is  
the bridge. I think we need to continue to push  
for that as well.  
But I know one thing that will  
not eliminate any traffic problem and that is to  
continue to do nothing. So --**  

**REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:**  
Well said.  

**SENIOR WARD:**  
I think that's where we're  
at. I hope we can get the wheels on something and  
roll it down the road until it's complete. So I  
know I appreciate all the work that you all have  
done. I know it's been a long tedious process, and  
it will continue to be that until we get  
something in place.  

**REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:**  
That's right. And you have to  
carry that torch.  

**SENIOR WARD:**  
Yeah. And we're certainly  
going to miss you. You've done a fabulous job for  
the last four years. And I know I will still be able  
to call on you. You'll probably call on me just as  
much as I call on you. So thank you for your  
service.  

**REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:**  
That's a deal. Thank you. No,  
I'm going to hug him. He's old enough to be my  
child -- young enough to be my child, so I'm going  
to hug him.  

Representative Franklin Foil.  

When you get to be my age, you get to be  
everybody's mamma.  

**REPRESENTATIVE FOIL:**  
Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.  

I'm going to be very brief, because I've been where  
all of you have sat and I've heard the comments. I  
agree with the proponents. I think this is a good  
plan.  

There are two things about this  
plan that I like, that I find appealing. One is it  
diverts traffic off the existing Mississippi River  
Bridge. It would put traffic on a bridge that's  
already built. A new bridge in Baton Rouge is long  
overdue, and I totally support that. And I  
appreciate the secretary's efforts, working with  
the legislature to make that happen. But we have  
another bridge right now that's being
Page 114

1 under-utilized, and this would get traffic off the
2 new bridge and use that asset.
3 The second thing that I found
4 very appealing about this project when it was
5 presented to our delegation was the fact that a
6 contractor would potentially pay 100 percent of
7 this project. And that's something that I hope --
8 today, I heard some of the testimony where there's
9 some issues in that respect for the first time.
10 But I've also heard from AECOM, their position that
11 they could potentially pay 100 percent of that
12 project.
13 So I hope that this committee
14 will continue to look at these proposals. I
15 believe that private/public partnerships are the
16 way of the future in our state for these mega
17 projects. And so I think this is a great
18 opportunity, and so I hope the committee would
19 evaluate all potential plans. And if there is a
20 plan where a contractor can pay for this and it's
21 not public funding, I think it's a win-win.
22 Thank you for your time.
23 [REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:]
24 That was the truth of the last
25 statement. Thank you -- thank you, Representative
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1 [Foil, for always being on that transportation]
2 side.
3 Mr. Kevin Durbin.
4 [UNIDENTIFIED PERSON:]
5 He had to leave.
6 [REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:]
7 Oh, bless his heart. Okay. He
8 knows where to find me.
9 Representative Dalton Honoré.
10 [REPRESENTATIVE HONORE:]
11 Thank you, Madam Chair. I
12 won't be very long either.
13 It appears, and I've sat here
14 as long as you have today, that we've reached an
15 impasse. We can't solve the problem today, but I
16 too -- the district I represent today as part of
17 the BUMP, proposed BUMP, take in that district. We
18 talk about the City of Baton Rouge that said it's
19 not feasible for them right now. They talking
20 about the BUMP -- I mean the loop. That reached a
21 dead end at one time looked like.
22 So I don't know. I'm here --
23 I'm in favor of the BUMP, and I've gone on record
24 of that. Our delegation is in favor of it. But
25 we're talking about the BUMP today and the loop
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1 tomorrow. We need to do something, and I too agree
2 with -- standing here with our hands tied, studying
3 and studying and studying, we're not getting any
4 place. Something needed to be done.
5 [REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:]
6 I know. And those of us that
7 are not engineers wish we could take study out the
8 proposal, but those of us who know what happens if
9 you do something negligently doesn't really help us
10 at all either. And that's being a non-engineer.
11 [REPRESENTATIVE HONORE:]
12 Right, and that is, but here
13 again, all I can say, is I'm a part of the capital
14 regional delegation and in favor of the BUMP. But
15 we got to move past what we doing today, and I
16 don't know how to do that. But we got to do
17 something to try to alleviate some of the problems
18 we got in Baton Rouge.
19 [REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:]
20 And we can't solve them without
21 more money.
22 [REPRESENTATIVE HONORE:]
23 Right, I understand that.
24 [REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:]
25 And we, absolutely, I am with
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1 you, need to solve -- unfortunately, right now,
2 it's going to be one step at a time.
3 [REPRESENTATIVE HONORE:]
4 Right, I totally understand
5 that. But again, I appreciate the opportunity to
6 appear before this --
7 [REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:]
8 Absolutely. I think it's a
9 great project too.
10 All right, Mr. Barry Huggins,
11 last but not least. I promise, since you from my
12 side of the river.
13 [MR. HUGGINS:]
14 Thank you, Madam Chairman, and
15 thank you members of the committee for the
16 opportunity to speak to you. And our parish
17 president couldn't be here today because he is part
18 of a group that's gone to St. Jude to do a benefit
19 for them and to cook for some of the families whose
20 children are being treated at St. Jude.
21 So I'm here to deliver a simple
22 message to you: Help. We're choking on the west
23 side of the river. And I listened to
24 Representative Carter, and I'm thinking, wow, some
25 of my folks have been calling him, because my folks
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1. I'm going to go ahead I think
2. -- do I have any opinions from the members?
3. Representative Smith -- I mean,
5. Senator Smith:
6. Where does this leave us? I'd
7. like to hear from the secretary a minute, because,
8. you know, I mean, as we make a proposal here -- we
9. make a motion and a proposal here, we know from the
10. staff a minute ago we're going to be short to go --
11. if we go forward with this, we're going to be short
12. financially to make the obligations. We have 500,
13. approximately, left in the approximately 750, 775.
14. How long is the study? I mean,
15. where does it leave us? I mean, and if we don't go
16. forward with this today, where does that leave us,
17. because we know -- we've heard one thing that's
18. consistent, that we have a problem. We all knew we
19. had a problem. That's why this committee is here.
20. We know we have to do something. But I haven't
21. totally heard anybody who said we are in love with
22. this. They just all said we need something.
23. So if you could give us a
24. little bit of a -- and where we leave ourselves one
25. way and the other, knowing that we are -- we do
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1. Let's not sit here and, as Representative Carter
2. said, study, study, study.
3. I realize that there's a
certain amount of that has to be done, but at
some point in time we just have to have the will to
move forward. And I thank you for an an
opportunity to speak.

REPRESENTATIVE ST. GERMAIN:

1. You are so quite welcome, and
2. please give Peevee my best.
3. Okay, members, do we have any
4. other questions we need to be answered?
5. My quick overview, since I know
6. Robert is about to chew me up. He's got to cancel
his -- usually he lengthens this meeting and then
he fusses me anyway.

But all of this was important
today, on a serious note. This is not the least
amount of time or the amount of time we've
taken. We took what we needed to take to listen to
everyone.
And as, right now, the sitting
legislator, who, along with Senator Adley, have a
lot of information about all of the transportation
issues, the biggest problem that we have is the
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1. lack of money. And we have unsuccessfully in some
2. instances tried to help that, and maybe
3. successfully, coming up, we'll be able to put a
4. dent in it. But I'm with you on -- I'm tired of
5. talking about this. I'm with you on whatever the
6. next steps need to be to get -- look, the entire
7. state needs help, but the Baton Rouge region has
8. neglected -- not the legislature, not the governor,
9. not DOTD. But we had such a plan so many years ago
10. and it did not provide for the growth of the Baton
11. Rouge area.
12. Because when I started coming
13. here -- everybody likes to give history -- in '89,
14. I promise you, I didn't have the problems that I
15. have had in the last eight years. And it's been
terrible. And we haven't funded transportation
like we should. And that's our fault.

We need, as legislators, to
make this -- and finally, I think it is -- one of
the major top priorities, along with health care
and education. Because I say it all the time, you
cannot go to the doctor and you cannot go to school
without traveling on a road. And around here,
getting to either one of those is at least an hour
extra you leave just in case.
Representative St. Germain:
Okay, Secretary Lebas.
Secretaries Lebas:
Well, Senator Smith, you know 6 and the people in the audience, I mean, I think 7 we have heard a lot of great comments and a lot of 8 support for the project. And I think that's 9 important to note that the project -- the project 10 is the BUMP. And we all know that there's not one 11 single solution for the region.
12 So we need, as a group, we 13 need to either vote to continue the PPP process, 14 okay, and you heard that that process would be 15 about 750,000 just to get to the PDA. That doesn't 16 include the cost of the PDA. Okay? That's an 17 additional to the 750,000. And you've heard that 18 we have 500,000 remaining in a cash line of credit 19 in capital outlay money. So that's where we are on 20 the financial part.
21 But if this body votes to not 22 continue with the PPP, that does not mean that we 23 cannot continue with the project. Okay? So if 24 this body chose not to continue with the PPP, one 25 idea or option could be that the remaining $550,000

Representative St. Germain:
Okay. Any other comments?
Okay. Any suggestions from the members?
All right. Well, I'm going to 23 -- I need to put this in my head and know how much 24 I support all of the projects in East Baton Rouge. 25 But at this point of the LTA -- and the bad news is

That we have remaining is that we could complete 2 the feasibility study. HNTB has done a good part 3 of it, and it could be completed with the 550,000.
Okay?
When that feasibility study is 5 completed, there's nothing that prohibits the LTA 6 coming together again and looking at this and 7 having the option to go out with the solicited PPP, 8 if this body so choses.
So, you know, I do believe as a 10 body, we do have options. So I just want to be 12 clear that even if it's not decided to go with this 13 PPP at this time, with solicitations, that we can 14 finish the feasibility study and actually - and 15 have it deliverable for this body with the 16 remaining money that remains in capital outlay.
And just to be clear about 18 studies and environmental assessments and all that, 19 I do want to talk about those -- you know, 20 there's federal requirements that we go through.
We follow the need for process and it's a federal 22 requirement. So I understand the frustration with 23 study, study, study. But we do need to -- we have 24 a process and that is feasibility studies, and then 25 we go into the environmental assessment, which is a

The LTA goes forward just until the new 1 administration takes over and the new legislative 2 process. And we -- even with the money we have, we 4 don't really have enough to do this right, and that 5 would not be fair to the proposers, who have done a 6 lot of work. And we appreciate that -- I can't 7 tell you how much I appreciate the thought of PPP 8 starting soon and everywhere in this state. But 9 this is the LTA's pretty much final meeting of the 10 year, so we need to make a decision.
So I think my motion today is 11 going to be to reject the unsolicited proposal for 12 the PPP, not go forward with the advertising for 14 competing proposals, and to recommend that the DOTD 15 use the remaining money to complete the feasibility 16 study on the BUMP, make recommendations to the LTA, 17 and absolutely talk about when to advance the BUMP 18 upon completion of the study.
And I can give you -- I can 20 give you that floor if you want -- you got it on 21 record? Okay. It's hard to repeat that at one 22 time.
So that's my motion, I put it 23 forward.
Do I have any discussion? Any
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| objections? |
| With all the sorrow in me, I |
| move that -- no objections, so moved. |
| Okay. Now, that's the hardest |
| -- that would be the hardest issue I've had to |
| deal with for one simple reason only, we need to |
| get funds, and we need to stop having to do this. |
| But we need to thank the groups, the AECOM for your |
| wonderful information and proposal, and we hope you |
| don't go far when we're ready to move this process |
| forward. |
| Thank you. The meeting is |
| adjourned. |
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