Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan Update

Executive Advisory Council Meeting – Round Three

*Baton Rouge, LA*
Why We Are Here Today

- Status Update – Statewide Transportation Plan
- Break Out Sessions
- Break
- Advisory Council Meetings
Why We Are Here Today

• AC 1 – (April 2013) Issues, Vision, Goals, Objectives

• AC 2 – (October 2013) Megaprojects, Initial Policy Recommendations

• AC 3 – (Today)
  – Review funding gap and revenue scenarios
  – Discuss prioritization of recommendations
  – Discuss funding sources
About the Plan – Plan Status

• Scheduled for completion May 2014
  – Draft ready in early spring 2014
• Aviation and rail plans are under final review
• Separate fast-track freight plan due August 2014 (estimated)
• Tasks to be completed
  – Megaproject approvals
  – Supporting policies and implementation strategies
  – Economic impact analysis
  – Report assembly
# 2014 Plan – Sources of Inputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People-focused Input</th>
<th>Analysis-assisted Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Interviews</td>
<td>Megaproject Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 Household Survey</td>
<td>Modal Needs Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator Survey</td>
<td>Revenue Scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Area Survey</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visioning Meetings</td>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megaproject Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s the Context around this Update?

• **Infrastructure**
  – Aging infrastructure
  – Increased demands, particularly in major travel corridors

• **Financial**
  – Pressing fiscal constraints, growing needs
  – Uncertainty regarding fiscal side of federal partnership
Context – Federal Fiscal Issues

Highway Trust Fund Receipts and Outlays Discrepancy

Receipts
Outlays

Excludes $8.017 billion transfer from General Fund to Highway Account of HTF in September 2008; $7 billion transfer from General Fund to Highway Account of HTF in August 2009; $19.5 billion transfer from General Fund to Highway and Mass Transit Accounts of HTF in March 2010; $2.4 billion transfer from Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund to HTF in July 2012; $6.2 billion transfer from General Fund to Highway Account of HTF in FY 2013; $10.4 billion transfer from General Fund to Highway Account of HTF in FY 2014; $2.2 billion transfer from General Fund to Mass Transit Account of HTF in FY 2014.
What’s the Context around this Update?

• Planning Trends
  – Congress emphasizes use of performance data for decisions in highway bill
  – More focus on modal integration, non-highway and non-motorized modes

• DOTD
  – Development of robust asset management tools
  – Safety, asset management, and modal plans completed or under development
# Draft Goals and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Preservation and Maintenance</th>
<th>Preserve Louisiana’s multimodal infrastructure in a state of good repair through timely maintenance of existing infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keep Louisiana’s highway pavement in good condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keep Louisiana’s bridges in good condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keep Louisiana’s other highway-related assets in good condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assist modal partners in achieving state-of-good repair for transit, port, and aviation facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Provide safe and secure travel conditions across all transportation modes through physical infrastructure improvements, operational controls, programs, and public education and awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce number and rate of highway-related fatalities and injuries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce number of highway crashes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce number of pedestrian and bicycle accidents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assist modal partners in achieving safe and secure transit, port, and aviation facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Draft Goals and Objectives (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Competitiveness</th>
<th>Provide a transportation system that fosters diverse economic and job growth, international and domestic commerce, and tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve level of service of freight transportation throughout Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve access to intermodal facilities and the efficiency of intermodal transfers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide predictable, reliable travel times throughout Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve connectivity between town centers and urban areas throughout Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Stewardship</th>
<th>Ensure transportation policies and investments are sensitive to Louisiana’s environmental issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimize the environmental impacts of building, maintaining, and operating the state transportation system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with all federal and state environmental regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Draft Goals and Objectives (cont.)

**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>
Performance Measures

• Are tied to goals and objectives
• Are realistic, based on data availability
• Are linked to plan implementation in accordance with MAP-21 guidance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Needs ($M)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>$22,947.7</td>
<td>DOTD pavement performance standards, current safety programs, and address major congestion issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized</td>
<td>$384.3</td>
<td>10% of non-interstate NHS, wider shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>$4,861.5</td>
<td>DOTD performance standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$7,184.4</td>
<td>Modest expansion for population growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ports &amp; Waterway</td>
<td>$7,107.3</td>
<td>Port improvements, dredging, deepening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>$2,640.0</td>
<td>Address existing deficiencies and long-term needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger/Freight Rail</td>
<td>$1,975.7</td>
<td>Short- and long-term capacity needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,100.9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Megaprojects

- **$41.5B Total**
  - $3.1B Other Sources
  - $925M Non-Hwy (9)

35 Interstate Projects
29 New Projects

- **Priority A**
  - 19 Projects $4.5B
    ($840M other sources)

- **Priority B**
  - 17 Projects $5B
    ($2.2B other sources)

- **Priority C**
  - 55 Projects $15.5B
    ($755M other sources)

- **Priority D**
  - 22 Projects $16.5B
Priority A Megaprojects

The Mississippi River Deepening Project is a part of Priority A
Priority D Megaprojects
Revenue Scenario Development

Scenario 1 - Baseline
- 0.5% Annual State and Federal Revenue Growth

Scenario 2 - Reduction
- Baseline + Major Reduction in Federal FY 15, Slight Rebound FY 16

Scenario 3 - Modest Increase
- Baseline + Dedicated Vehicle Sales Tax $ Beginning FY 20

Scenario 4 - Aggressive Increase
- Baseline + Dedicated Vehicle Sales Tax $ Beginning FY 20 + $300M Annual Federal Increase Beginning FY 19
## 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>1B-Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>Total</td>
<td>$18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Avg.</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Funding Gap: Needs vs. Baseline Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Baseline Revenues (in Billions)</th>
<th>Funding Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road &amp; Bridge</td>
<td>$28.19</td>
<td>$15.60</td>
<td>$12.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$7.18</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterways &amp; Ports</td>
<td>$7.11</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger/Freight Rail</td>
<td>$1.98</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>$2.64</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
<td>$1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$47.10</td>
<td>$18.60</td>
<td>$28.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rural Area Survey Results

• Viable Industries
  – Natural resource-based
  – Tourism, recreation, retirement communities
  – Cottage industries

• Transportation Improvements
  – Improve access to attract industry, preserve mobility in transportation corridors
  – Human services and higher speed access to jobs

• Policies
  – Target/focus resources to maximize impact
  – Coordinate with LED to complement economic development investments
Break Out Sessions

• Highway Ops/RPOs
  – Megaprojects
  – Revenue Scenarios
  – Budget Partitions
  – Policy Recommendations
  – Plan Implementation

• Other ACs
  – Revenue Scenarios
  – Budget Partitions
  – Policy Recommendations
  – Plan Implementation

DOTD
CDM Smith
Aviation

• Revenue Discussion
  – Scenario 2B is most likely
  – Concern with mixing needs and revenue
  – Logical Funding Options
    • Motor Fuels Sales Tax
    • Violation Surcharge

• Policy Recommendations
  – Not enough talent in state for airplane mechanics and pilots
  – Coordination with DOTD and LED

• Aviation Plan Discussion
  – Drop Recommendation A-28, conflicts with A-19
  – Remove 1 airport from NPIAS
  – Concern with adding airports to Parishes that don’t have one now – Livingston and Plaquemines
Community Development & Enhancement – Revenue Discussion

• Both Groups chose Scenario 3B (or a new scenario between 3B and 4B)

• Group 1: Take $ from Access Mgmt and add to Urban Transit
  – Aging Population, Millennial Demand

• Group 2:
  – Decrease Local Assistance Program by $10M and add to Intermodal Connectors
  – Increase megaprojects in earlier years to get capital funding and decrease in later years but decrease overall to distribute to programs below
  – Increase Transp. Alternatives to $23M
  – Increase Local Road Safety Program to $10M
Community Development & Enhancement – Revenue Discussion

• Viable Funding Options
  – Indexing or % of Statewide Sales Tax
  – Local Option Tax (state needs to give authority)
  – Advanced Transp. Districts
  – Tolling - Only New Capacity
  – Motor Fuels Sales Tax
  – Increase Registration Fees – especially for 3rd & 4th vehicle

• New Funding Option
  – Project Specific – Tax on New Industrial Development – Require Transportation Impact Plans Prior to Construction

• No VMT User Fee
Community Development & Enhancement – Policy Recommendations/Plan Implementation

• Policy Recommendations
  – Added “Local Assistance Road Program” – Medium Priority
  – Added “Increase State Assistance in Transportation Planning for Non-Metro Areas.” – High Priority (this was also a mentioned in RPO/State Hwy O&M)

• Plan Implementation
  – PR Campaign to educate public and legislators on the Plan – (Needs, Projects, Funding Limitations, Funding Options)
    • In Layman Terms
    • Canned Presentations/Talking Points for Partners and Stakeholders
  – Policy Committee should appoint a committee to promote/implement the Plan
Regional Planning Officials | State Highway Operations & Maintenance

- Asset Management Plan
- Megaprojects – validated Priority A & B List
- Revenue Scenario Discussion
  - Scenario 3B is most likely
  - Reduced Hwy Preservation $ due to decrease in needs
  - Increase Major Repairs/Generators/Pump Stations Line Item
  - Increase Parish Transportation Fund
  - Increase Interstate Lighting
- Viable Funding Options
  - Gas Tax/Sales Tax/Indexing – 6 to 8 Votes
  - Local Option Tax/VMT User Fee – 12 to 14 Votes
• Policy Recommendations – New Topics
  – Allow Mobility Funds to be used on Megaprojects
  – Convert Public Fleet to Alternative Fuels
  – ADA Compliance Program
  – Support Military Presence in Project Selection
  – Raise Letter Bid Capital Costs to $1M (from $500K)
  – Allow Federal Funded Projects to be Bid in Districts
Freight Rail – Revenue/Funding

• Revenue Discussion
  – Scenario 3B is most likely
  – Increase Freight Rail Program to $25M/year

• Funding Options
  – Low: Gas Sales Tax, VMT, Advanced Transp. Districts, Sales Tax
  – Low to Medium: Local Option
  – Medium: Indexing, Registration Fees, Project Specific Tax
  – Medium to High: Tolling

• New Funding Options
  – Public Private Partnerships (P3)
  – Investigate funding through State Infrastructure Bank
Freight Rail – Policy Recommendations

• Revise CDE-11: Financially support Southern Rail Commission (SRC). Provide continued financial support for the SRC

• Merge INF-12 with other [Statewide Rail System Program funding] with “Support establishment of state-funded Rail Retention and Infrastructure Program...” + “provide statewide funding for” shortline rail program

• Delete last policy recommendation from Economic Council “provide advocacy for rail shippers”
Ports & Waterways

• Performance Measures – Change wording to 1 (port deepening)
• Scenario 3B is most likely
• Port Priority Program should be doubled
• Not accounting for O&M needs
• Funding Options
  – Use Capital Outlay funds to match $ for channel deepening
  – State has authority to tax shippers, can $ be used for channel deepening (issue for Plan)
  – DOTD does not have authority to use TTF on navigation projects
  – Advanced Transportations Districts for specific projects
  – Local Option Tax
Ports & Waterways

• New Funding Options
  – Vehicle Sales Tax dedication to Port Program is under threat
  – New 1 Cent per gallon tax on all fuels except for aviation
  – General Sales Tax of ¼ cent towards maritime

• Megaprojects
  – MS River Deepening – change DOTD contribution from $0 to State Contribution of $150M from Capital Outlay Funds
Trucking – Revenue/Funding Options

- Prefer Scenario 3B (in between 3B and 4B)
- Increase Interstate Pvmnt Preservation (looks low compared to other preservation $)
- Bridge maintenance/weight limits due to aging & deterioration causing truck re-routing
- Oppose indexing motor fuels tax
- Oppose VMT User Fee
- Like Project Specific Tax (defined by time, amount and project for all fuels)
- Equitable tax for alternative fuel vehicles
Trucking – Policy Recommendations/Megaprojects

• New Policy: Collaborate, coordinate with LED to provide transportation needs and solutions for businesses.
• Revise #10 - Consolidate state trucking regulatory, safety, and enforcement affairs in 1 agency.
• #19 – Need to include “restore” for routes supporting energy and mining.
• Megaprojects
  – Move Leake Avenue from Priority D to A and tie to the Ports of New Orleans Expansion project.
Thank you!

http://www.dotd.la.gov/study/

Dan Broussard
(Dan.Broussard@LA.GOV)