

Use of New Visions Budgets for Round One Programming Targets

Background

CDTC's adopted programming process has proven successful when there is sufficient competitive-source funding available to have two or three rounds of programming decisions. When this is possible, CDTC's practice is to assign funds to *only* those project categories (from the New Visions budget) that have the greatest funding deficiencies relative to the budget levels set in New Visions.

For example, if current TIP commitments (and non-TIP funding) for one project category average \$15 M annually against a New Visions 20-year budget value of \$30 M, it is deficient by \$10M per year or 50%. Another project category may have current TIP commitments of \$50 M against a New Visions budget of \$52 M. It is only \$2 M or 4% short. In round one, the Planning Committee would traditionally assign funds to the first project category, not to the second category. By doing so, CDTC ensures that the actual program achieves the goal of "steady progress" across all project types.

Results of the CDTC merit evaluation would provide the prioritized lists of candidates in each category, which are used to select projects for funding in round one.

In round two (and three, if there is one), the Planning Committee opens the consideration to all projects in all categories and seeks to select additional projects for funding based on quantitative merit, other compelling non-quantitative arguments, geographic distribution and other issues to ensure a balanced program.

Current Budget Assessment

Current funding commitments drawn from the seven-year draft 2009-14 TIP (including the committed years of 2007-08 and 2008-09) are added to estimates of non-TIP funding commitments to determine current annual funding levels by New Visions budget category. These values are then compared to the 20-year annual average budgets in the adopted New Visions 2030 plan. . This comparison is shown in Table 1.

It is important to remember that the New Visions values reflect careful examination of need versus financial constraint.

Examples of the kind of analysis incorporated into the New Visions values are:

- Full link-by-link, bridge-by-bridge assessment of major system infrastructure needs and a commitment to reconstruct much – but not all – of the system by 2030
- Detailed modeling of financial needs to meet bridge and bridge deck needs on all state and local bridges
- Modeling of modest goal attainment of pavement conditions on state and non-state roads while addressing accommodation of other modes
- Incorporation of CDTA’s vehicle replacement cycle and BRT implementation costs
- Updated costs to complete existing “major” TIP projects
- A budget for further highway capacity actions based on policies in CDTC’s Congestion Management System
- A budget specifically to support community compatibility and economic development projects which would not be priorities solely on the basis of infrastructure condition or congestion.
- Detailed estimates of ITS needs to meet the region’s mobility needs without excessive highway expansion
- Estimates of annualized requirements for supplemental TIP actions to support planning, goods movement, safety, demand management, bike and pedestrian network

The current annual commitment to all 17 budget categories is estimated at approximately \$502 M, in contrast to the adopted twenty-year annual average value of \$654 M. Thus overall, current commitments cover 76.5% of the New Visions budget.

Specific Implications for Round One Targets

With an overall implementation level of 76.5%, it would be appropriate for the Planning Committee to assign round one funds to project categories for which *current funding levels fall well short of the average value*.

The following budget categories have the greatest percentage deficiencies relative to the New Visions budget. Each has current funding commitments that total less than 60% of New Visions values.

1. Highway Rehabilitation and Reconstruction: current funding is at 38.2% of New Visions levels. The absolute shortfall is \$105 M annually.
2. Demand Management: current funding is at 44% of New Visions levels, although CDTA and CDTC are pursuing the most promising CMAQ-eligible leads.
3. Stand-alone goods movement actions: these are largely non-existent on the TIP.
4. Stand-alone access management actions: these are largely non-existent on the TIP.
5. Intelligent Transportation Systems (capital and operating): current funding is at 47% of New Visions values, with a shortfall of \$8.1 M annually.
6. Community Compatibility / Economic Development (“Linkage-type”): current funding is at 56% of New Visions values with a shortfall of \$5.4 M annually.

Of these six categories, only the highway rehab and reconstruction deficit is by far the largest in absolute numbers. Bridge rehab and replacement is second in absolute deficit (\$22.9 M annually), although unprogrammed HBRR funds may help reduce that value.

The implication is that the bulk of round one funding should be assigned to highway and bridge rehabilitation / reconstruction (with accommodation of the needs of non-auto modes, etc.). This could be assigned with or without smaller target values for the other few categories that are well below average in reaching New Visions funding levels.

Table 1
Comparison of New Visions 2030 Finance Plan and Current Funding
Regional Transportation Plan Budget by Element

			<i>adopted</i>		
		Current 2009-14 TIP + Other Funding	New Visions 2030 Full Implement ation	elements with an annual deficit	Comments
REGIONAL PROGRAMS¹					
1	Intermodal Facilities	42.100	41.600	---	
2	Transit Infrastructure	37.600	16.807	---	not all certain
3	Transit Service	60.000	63.000	3.000	not eligible for TIP
4	ITS (Technology) and Traffic Infrastructure	7.100	15.250	8.150	
5	ITS (Technology) and Traffic Operations				
6	Highway Rehab, Reconstruction and Redesign -- Priority Network	64.700	169.200	104.500	all highways combined
7	Highway Rehabilitation & Reconstruction – Other				
8	Bridge Rehab & Reconstruction	66.100	89.100	22.900	unprogrammed HBRR avail?
9	Highway and Bridge Maintenance	191.000	218.000	27.000	not eligible for TIP
10	Strategic Highway and Bridge Actions -- CMS-based (capacity)	15.100	8.900	---	at draft 09-14 TIP costs
11	Strategic Highway and Bridge Actions – Economic Development /Community Compatibility	6.900	12.300	5.400	
12	Supplemental Goods Movement Accommodations	0.200	5.100	4.900	overlap with intermodal category?
13	Supplemental Bike & Pedestrian Accommodations	4.300	3.700	---	
14	Supplemental Access Management Actions	0.200	0.700	0.500	
15	Supplemental Safety Actions	2.000	5.300	3.300	
16	Demand Management	0.900	2.000	1.100	
17	Integrated Planning & Outreach	4.400	4.500	0.100	
TOTAL		502.500	655.387	181.000	deficits only
				150.800	TIP-eligible deficits only

¹ All values are in millions of 2007\$, annually over 25 years, 2006-2030. Current funding levels derived from draft 2009-14 TIP, including 2007-08 and 2008-09 committed years. “Non-TIP” funding values are taken from estimates in the New Visions 2030 plan and include state, local and UPWP funding.