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Covers all modes – freight and passenger. Economic growth is a major driver.
Contents of the Statewide Transportation Plan

- **Policy Actions** (e.g., port hours of operation)
- **Programs** (e.g., highway asset management, operations, safety, small capacity; ports; airports; transit; bike/ped; rail; intermodal connectors; local programs)
- **Megaprojects** (large, high-cost projects such as Interstate widenings, major bridge replacements, etc.)
- **Stand-Alone Plans** (incorporated within or referenced/coordinated with)
  - Asset Management
  - Aviation
  - Freight (all modes)
  - LA International Commerce Master Plan
  - Rail (freight and passenger)
  - Strategic Highway Safety Plan
Legislative Questionnaire – Where Funding Should Go

- Providing additional transportation choices such as walking, biking, and transit: 17%
- Providing essential public transportation services for elderly, disabled, and low income citizens: 18%
- Improving transportation safety: 19%
- Reducing commute times: 26%
- Strengthening the economy and creating/sustaining jobs: 54%
- Maintaining what we have: 77%

Percent Responding As Very Important (Rank of 1 or 2 out of 6)
Legislative Questionnaire – Type Projects Most Needed

- Improving freight railroads to enhance service and reliability in support of Louisiana industry (7%)
- Improving airports to better accommodate tourism, business travel, personal travel, and air cargo (8%)
- Increased modal choices for passengers (8%)
- Safety-related investments across all transportation modes (8%)
- Reduce congestion by increasing transit and non-motorized services (8%)
- Reduce congestion by improving operations with low cost projects (28%)
- Improving ports in support of Louisiana industry (31%)
- Reduce congestion by highway capacity expansion (54%)
- Maintenance/preservation projects across all transportation modes (59%)

Percent Responding as Very Important
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**Legislative Questionnaire – Feasible Funding Options**

- **Tolls approved by local voters**: 61%
- **Savings from outsourcing/privatizing state services**: 46%
- **Local option taxes/fees**: 31%
- **Reducing other state expenditures, such as higher education, health care, etc., to allow greater expenditures in transportation**: 17%
- **Other (responses included increase in state gas tax, public-private partnerships, more effective spending)**: 33%

Percent Responding as Feasible (Rank of 4 or 5 out of 5)
Transportation Important to Quality of Life and Economy? 97%

Convenient, Reliable Air Service? 69%

Roads and Bridges Safe? 51%

Safe, Convenient for Bike/Ped? 34%

Convenient, Reliable Public Transportation? (17% No Opinion) 37%

Roads and Bridges in Good Condition? 28%

■ % Strongly Agree or Somewhat Agree
Public Survey – Importance of Investments

- **Maintain what we have**: 91% (Very Important to All)
- **Increase safety – all modes**: 78% (Very Important to Most)
- **Ports to attract business, jobs**: 73% (Very Important to Most)
- **Reduce congestion – technology/low cost**: 74% (Very Important to Most)
- **Railroads for economic development**: 63% (Very Important to Some)
- **Reduce congestion – new capacity**: 61% (Very Important to Some)
- **Basic transp. for elderly/disabled/low income**: 58% (Very Important to Some)
- **Reduce congestion – transit & bike/ped**: 45% (Very Important to Less than Half)
- **More non-highway transp. choices**: 41% (Very Important to Less than Half)
Public Survey – Priorities

- Improve existing roads: 77%
- New roads/added lanes: 17%
- Broad range of transportation options: 51%
- Primarily on roads and autos: 42%
Public Survey – Revenue Options

Reducing expenditures on higher education, health care, etc.
- 23%

Voter-approved tax by parish/city
- 78%

Voter-approved tolls
- 61%

Opened ended question on how to pay for projects (in addition to above):
- #1 response – no other ideas (51%)
- #2 response – more effective spending (18%)
- #3 response – some sort of taxes/fees (14%)
Public Survey – Future Land Use Patterns

A state with large cities like Atlanta or Dallas with higher density development

A state with large cities like Atlanta or Dallas with suburban-type development

A state with small and medium-sized cities with open space between them

Does not matter

29%

10%

4%

53%
Possible Futures

- Economic Scenarios
- Land Use Scenarios
Extractive and Resource Industry Focus

Commodity Shipments, Oil, Agriculture, Mining, etc. 2040
Arts, Entertainment, Retirement, and Tourism Focus

Arts, Entertainment, Health Jobs 2040

[Map showing distribution of jobs by thousands, with color-coding for different employment ranges.]
Research and Technology Focus

Tech Jobs 2040
## Scenario Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1- Extractive and Resource Industry Focus</th>
<th>2- Arts, Entertainment, Retirement and Tourism Focus</th>
<th>3- Research and Technology Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Population Centers</td>
<td>Mostly separated</td>
<td>Mostly integrated</td>
<td>Mix of integrated and separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Density</td>
<td>Lower density, overall</td>
<td>Increases slightly, overall</td>
<td>Increases more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Oil, gas, agriculture development</td>
<td>Festivals, amenities for seniors, new tourism attractions</td>
<td>University-research, hi-tech, coastal management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Status Quo - Continued expansion of suburban development patterns
Town Centers- Development focused in centers of urban areas (10k +)
Urban Centers - Development focused in centers of urbanized areas (50k +)
## Scenario Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1- Status Quo</th>
<th>2- Town Centers</th>
<th>3- Urban Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Type</td>
<td>More suburban development in many areas</td>
<td>More development within centers of areas (10K +)</td>
<td>Most development within largest urbanized areas (50K+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Boundary</td>
<td>Expands outward</td>
<td>Stays the same</td>
<td>Could decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>Lower density, overall</td>
<td>Increases slightly, overall</td>
<td>Increases more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visioning Workshop – Key Outcomes

• **Land Use**
  – Most likely scenario is status quo of continued suburban development BUT preferred scenario is Town Centers with growth in small to mid-size cities and towns with quality green space in-between except for New Orleans that has growth concentrated in the urban area.

• **Economic Development**
  – Preferred scenario is continuation of focus on extractive and resource industries (a current focus in the state), but with more emphasis on arts/retirement/tourism as well as research/technology developments.

• **Policy Shift**
  – The preferred scenarios require changes in public policy and state/federal/local cooperation.

• **Goals**
  – Streamline existing 7 goals and 49 objectives.
Draft Vision and Goals

• Vision:
  – Mostly small and medium-sized communities with quality open space in-between
  – But also higher-growth, dense, compact urban areas such as New Orleans
  – Support extractive and resource industries, a major economic driver in the state
  – Consider and support the potential for increased economic activity associated with arts, entertainment, retirement and tourism as well as a research & technology

• Goals:
  – Infrastructure Preservation and Maintenance
  – Safety
  – Economic Competitiveness
  – Community Development and Enhancement
  – Environmental Stewardship
## Draft Goals and Objectives

### Infrastructure Preservation and Maintenance

*Preserve Louisiana’s multimodal infrastructure in a state of good repair through timely maintenance of existing infrastructure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Keep Louisiana’s highway pavement in good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keep Louisiana’s bridges in good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keep Louisiana’s other highway-related assets in good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assist modal partners in achieving state-of-good repair for transit, port, and aviation facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Safety

*Provide safe and secure travel conditions across all transportation modes through physical infrastructure improvements, operational controls, programs, and public education and awareness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce number and rate of highway-related fatalities and injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce number of highway crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce number of pedestrian and bicycle accidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assist modal partners in achieving safe and secure transit, port, and aviation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve level of service of freight transportation throughout Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve access to intermodal facilities and the efficiency of intermodal transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide predictable, reliable travel times throughout Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve connectivity between town centers and urban areas throughout Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Stewardship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimize the environmental impacts of building, maintaining and operating the state transportation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with all federal and state environmental regulations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community Development and Enhancement

**Provide support for community transportation planning, infrastructure and services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Cooperate with and support MPOs and other local agencies in development of plans, including comprehensive Plans, and programs to ensure consistency with statewide goals, needs and priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide support to local governments to seek sustainable revenue for local transportation needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce barriers to state and local collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhance access to jobs for both urban and rural populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve modal options associated with supporting the economy and quality of life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Analyses – Mapping Travel Flows

2030 Business Trips

2030 Tourist Trips

Business Trips

Tourist Trips
Regional Planning Officials received presentations on 102 Megaprojects
Key Issues to Consider

• What tools do local governments need to become more autonomous?

• What do we do about the rural communities; do they have a future?

• How do we protect the integrity and character of local communities so they don’t get absorbed into giant urban areas?
  - Louisiana citizens want small and medium-sized cities with open space between them

• How are we going to accommodate and serve an aging population?
  - By 2040, one out of every five people in Louisiana will be 65 or older (1 of 8 now)
    How many? 2040 = 1,051,790 people  2010 = 558,940 people
  - By 2040, one out of every ten people in Louisiana will be 75 or older (1 of 16 now)
    How many? 2040 = 550,530 people  2010 = 246,340 people
Scenario 1: Baseline – no increase in state or federal funds

Scenario 2: Reduction – no increase in state funds, decrease in federal funds

Scenario 3: Modest Increase – vehicle sales tax added to revenue stream beginning in FY 19-20

Scenario 4: Aggressive Increase – VST plus $300 million/year added to revenue stream beginning in FY 19-20
## Revenue Totals by Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Scenario Revenue Levels, FY 2012 - 2044, Constant 2010 Dollars, in Billions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scenario 1 (Baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Road &amp; Bridge</td>
<td>$15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Billions)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Average (Billions)</td>
<td><strong>$0.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Preliminary Transportation Needs

**2012 – 2044 including current backlog**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Needs ($B)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>$22.95</td>
<td>DOTD pavement performance standards, current safety programs and address major congestion issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorized</td>
<td>$0.38</td>
<td>10% of non-Interstate NHS, wider shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>$4.86</td>
<td>DOTD performance standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$7.11</td>
<td>Modest expansion for population growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port</td>
<td>$7.11</td>
<td>Port improvements, dredging, deepening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>$2.64</td>
<td>Address existing deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass/Freight Rail</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>Short term capacity needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass/Freight Rail</td>
<td>$1.84</td>
<td>Longer-term capacity needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47.10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Funding Gap: Needs vs. Baseline Revenues (Scenario 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Needs (Billions of Constant 2010$)</th>
<th>Baseline Revenues</th>
<th>Funding Gap</th>
<th>Average Annual Shortage (Millions of Constant 2010$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Road &amp; Bridge</td>
<td>$27.8</td>
<td>$15.6</td>
<td>$12.2</td>
<td>$370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorized</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>$5.3</td>
<td>$161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterway and Port</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight &amp; Passenger Rail</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$865</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decision-Making Process

Policy Committee
(State Legislators, Secretaries of DOTD and Economic Development, other)

Executive Advisory Council
(DOTD Executives, Advisory Council Chairs)

Aviation  Freight Rail  State Highway Operations and Maintenance  Ports and Waterways  Regional Planning Officials  Community Development and Enhancement  Trucking

Previously ITS AC  Previously Intermodal AC  Previously Surface Transportation AC
Policy Committee

- Senate President John Alario
- Senator Robert Adley
- Senator Mike Walsworth
- House Speaker Chuck Kleckley
- Representative Karen St. Germain
- Representative Stephen Pugh
- DOTD Secretary Sherri LeBas – **Policy Committee Chair**
- LED Secretary Stephen Moret
- Robert Scott, President, Public Affairs Research Council

**Duties:**

- Serve as the final decision-making body for the update of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan;
- Establish priorities among transportation-related, economic development projects and/or services;
- Advise other members of the Legislature, local elected officials, public and private agencies, companies, groups, and individuals on transportation issues pertaining to policies, regulations, programs, projects, and funding.
Schedule

• **Target completion date = mid-Summer 2014**
  - Complete technical analyses
  - Complete stakeholder input
  - Formulate plan
  - Conduct economic impact analyses
  - Draft document ready in late Spring 2014

• **Asset Management Plan target completion = February 2014**

• **Draft Aviation Plan complete**

• **Freight Plan target completion = early Fall 2014**
  - MAP-21 compliant

• **Draft LA International Commerce Master Plan complete**

• **Draft Rail Plan complete**

• **Strategic Highway Safety Plan complete**
What’s at stake?

The policies, programs, and projects in the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan are intended to:

- Support the wealth-building industries and employment that we already have;
- Strengthen our foundation for economic growth;
- Take advantage of opportunities in international trade;
- Enhance the quality of life for Louisiana citizens; and
- Send the message that our state is progressive.