PURPOSE

The purpose of the Third Round of Advisory Council meetings was to brief the Advisory Councils on the status of the Plan update, discuss revenue scenarios, review and finalize the policy recommendations, and discuss Plan implementation.

Note: This meeting summary is a compilation of the input received from the Advisory Council members and reflects the views expressed.

HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- Vision, Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures
- Revenue Forecast Charts
- Revenue Forecast Line Items by Advisory Council
- Funding Options
- Community Development & Enhancement Policy Recommendations

MEETING SUMMARY

Opening Session

In the opening session, the Advisory Council members received information about the status of the Plan update. Highlights of the presentation included:
• Plan Status
  o Plan completion scheduled for mid-2014
  o Aviation and rail plans are under final review
  o Tasks to be completed:
    ▪ Megaproject approvals
    ▪ Supporting policies and implementation strategies
    ▪ Economic impact analysis
    ▪ Report assembly
• Vision, Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures
  o Final draft to be approved by Executive AC and Policy Committee
• Megaprojects
  o 113 projects were presented in August 2013 and sorted into Priorities A through D
  o A total of $41.5B in projects were submitted including 29 new projects, 10 non-highway projects and 35 interstate projects
• Financial forecast
  o Scenario 1 (Baseline revenues) will generate $18.6B by 2044
  o Scenario 2 (Reduction) will generate $16.1B by 2044
  o Scenario 3 (Modest Increase) will generate $28.1B by 2044
  o Scenario 4 (Aggressive Increase) will generate $35.1B by 2044
• Gap and Revenue Scenarios
  o How do we address the funding gap between revenues and needs?
  o Total shortfall over 33 years per mode:
    ▪ Roadway & Bridge: $12.59B
    ▪ Transit: $5.38B
    ▪ Freight & Passenger Rail: $1.98B
    ▪ Waterways & Ports: $6.61B
    ▪ Aviation: $1.94B
• Rural Louisiana Survey Results
  o Viable industries: natural resource-based; tourism, recreation, retirement communities; and Cottage industries
  o Transportation improvements: Improve access to attract industry, preserve mobility in transportation corridors; human services and higher speed access to jobs
  o Policies: Target/focus resources to maximize impact, coordinate with LED to complement economic development investments

Community Development and Enhancement Advisory Council Meeting
The agenda for the breakout Community Development and Enhancement Advisory Council meeting included:
• Welcome/Introductions
• Statewide Transportation Plan Update
  o Revenue Scenarios Discussion
  o Policy Recommendations Discussion
  o Megaprojects
  o Plan Implementation Discussion
  o Wrap Up/Next Steps
Introductions/Opening Remarks
Krista Goodin, CDM Smith facilitator, welcomed the group and Kent Rogers, AC Chair, led a round of introductions. Ms. Goodin gave a short presentation on the status of the Statewide Transportation Plan update. Key points discussed after the presentation included:

Revenue/Funding Options Discussion
- Passenger rail projects won’t happen without some state legislation and support
- Major industry/development should be required to conduct traffic impact study and assist with funding needed transportation improvements
- Believes Revenue Scenario 3B and something in between 3B and 4B is realistic
- Increase Urban Transit funds and take away from Access Management
- Increase Transportation Alternative Program (MAP-21 program)
- Double funds for Intermodal Program
- Equalize Rural and Urban Transit at $7.5M each
- Implement Megaprojects earlier (2042 projects should be done in 2022) and reduce funding to $100M
- Strongly support Local Option Gas tax
- Continue TIMED program
- Supports tolling only on new capacity
- Supports project-specific tax on new industry
- Strongly opposed to VMT tax (primarily because not sure how it would be implemented)
- Opposed to violation surcharge tax

Policy Recommendations Discussion
- Some of the recommendations are projects/programs and not policy so remove “Policy” from title
- Delete reference to $20M or $30M to local assistance policy recommendations so it doesn’t need to change if funding is not at that level
- Members asked to have more time to review the policy recommendations. The members were asked to provide any comments or additional edits by February 7, 2014

Plan Implementation Discussion
- Make all legislators and DOTD staff knowledgeable of transportation plan and infrastructure funding crisis
- Make public knowledgeable of transportation plan and infrastructure funding crisis
- Make info available and provided in layman’s terms to public and community leaders
- Enhance DOTD presentations @ road shows
- Need talking points, marketing info for partners and stakeholders to present the plan
- Policy Committee should appoint committee to promote/implement plan
- Info needs to be put together in concise fashion (what are the needs, projects that can’t be done w/o funding, what’s the gap)
COMMENTS RECEIVED FOLLOWING MEETING
The AC members were email the Draft Vision, Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures and the Draft Community Development & Enhancement Policy Recommendations. They were asked to review and provide additional comments or edits by February 7, 2014. The following comments were received:

Visions, Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures
- Pg. 3, Performance Measure “Number of crashes at rail crossings” – FTA needs to be changed to Federal Railroad Administration Office of Safety Analysis. Data is available on-line to look at crashes reported by crossing location
- Pg. 5, Can we add a Performance Measure “Percentage of Working Population Groups Using Transit”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measurement Status/Development Need</th>
<th>FWHA Req.</th>
<th>Anticipated Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Working Population Groups Using Transit</td>
<td>Refer to US Bureau of the Census American Community Survey (for applicable localities) for transit use related to work trips; Supplemental methodology required to determine values for small urban and rural areas not meeting ACS population threshold</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reported on regular basis for parishes participating in ACS/US Bureau of the Census</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Pg 6, Can we add an indirect measure “Percentage of Population using Transportation Alternatives”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Measure</th>
<th>Measurement Status/Development Need</th>
<th>FWHA Req.</th>
<th>Anticipated Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Working Population Groups Using Transportation Alternatives</td>
<td>Refer to US Bureau of the Census American Community Survey (for applicable localities) for mode choice (transit, bike, pedestrian, walking, work at-home, other) related to work trips; Supplemental methodology required to determine values for small urban and rural areas not meeting ACS population threshold</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reported on regular basis for parishes participating in ACS/US Bureau of the Census</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Development and Enhancement Policy Recommendations
- Pg 1, In CDE Goal No. 3 – can we change the word “planning” (2nd word, 1st sentence) to “implementation”
- Pg. 1, In CDE Goal No. 10, - can we add the state departments LA Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) and LA Division of Health and Hospitals (DHH)?
- Pg. 1, In CDE Goal No. 11 – Just a question, is the term “Southern Rail Commission (SRC)” now the most current name for this group?
- Pg. 2, In CDE Goal No. 16 – the term “fixed-route transit” needs to be removed from this statement. This type of service is already operated by Jefferson Transit from the MSY terminal on Airline Highway to the Superdome. Also, should the term “Re-evaluate” be changed to “Evaluate”?