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- Study Purpose & Background
- Policy Analysis
- Work Program Analysis
Purpose & Background

- Policy analysis of the transportation provisions
- Analyze Work Program that incorporates growth management funding
- Interim presentations and reporting to the Commission at workshops – December 6 and March 7
Project Progress

- FTC engaged CUTR in 10/05
- Progress report to FTC 12/6/05
- Draft report to FTC staff and FDOT 2/7/06
- Comments from FTC staff and FDOT 3/21/06 (on Work Program) & 4/4/06 (on Policy Paper)
- Final Report presented 5/23/06
Policy Analysis
Positive Steps

- Tightens financial feasibility and concurrency
  - Financial feasibility definition
  - De minimis reporting
  - Timeframe for concurrency
  - TCEA funding and mobility strategies

- Funding for transportation backlogs
  - Transportation Regional Incentive Program
Positive Steps

- Community visioning and urban service boundaries
- Establishes advisory groups
  - Impact Fee Task Force
  - Century Commission
  - OPPAGA Task Force
Financial Feasibility

- Definition requires financial feasibility over 5-year period
- Long-term concurrency management systems over 10-year period
- Effect of allowing financial feasibility over longer period of time?
Strategic Intermodal System

- Increased emphasis on protecting the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS)
  - Protect capacity and enhance mobility
  - Potential consequences
    - Shift development
    - Shift in funding
Proportionate Fair Share

- Impacts “mitigated by the cooperative effort of public and private sectors”

- Prop share as envisioned by FDOT Model Ordinance requires existing CMS

- Application of mandated DRI formula to multimodal facilities

- “The requirement that level-of-service standards be achieved and maintained shall not apply if the proportionate-share process is used.”
Intergovernmental Coordination

- Among local governments
  - Address cross-jurisdictional impacts
  - Is “encouragement” enough motivation?
- Between local governments and the FDOT
  - Consultations regarding SIS impacts
Big Picture

- Challenges
  - Different CMSs
  - Link-by-link vs. system-wide LOS
- Achieving concurrency
  - Funding concerns
- Continuing equity concerns
  - Last developer in pays
  - Consider consumption-based fee?
Work Program
Work Program Analysis

- Comparison of July 2005 Adopted Work Program (FY 2006 to FY 2010) to the Tentative Work Program (FY 2007 to FY 2011) as of 2/14/06
- Analysis performed on 5-year and 6-year basis
## Adopted vs. Tentative Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adopted Work Program</th>
<th>Tentative Work Program</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$11,064,220,291</td>
<td>$9,865,575,551</td>
<td>-10.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$6,241,182,704</td>
<td>$8,969,393,094</td>
<td>43.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$5,938,626,495</td>
<td>$7,436,272,665</td>
<td>25.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$5,501,500,287</td>
<td>$6,712,758,045</td>
<td>22.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$5,671,403,387</td>
<td>$6,639,862,122</td>
<td>17.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$3,204,043,645</td>
<td>$7,130,391,659</td>
<td>122.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Total</td>
<td>$34,416,933,164</td>
<td>$36,888,677,585</td>
<td>7.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Hurricane spending is excluded
** Does not include Miscellaneous
Growth Management Funding - Programs

- New Starts Transit Program
- Small County Outreach Program
- Strategic Intermodal System
- Transportation Regional Incentive Program
- State Infrastructure Bank
- County Incentive Grant Program
## Growth Management Programs – Annual Totals – Tentative Work Program

### Background

- Policy Analysis

### Work Program

#### Growth Management Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>6-Year Total</th>
<th>5-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Incentive Grant Program</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Intermodal System</td>
<td>$291</td>
<td>$481</td>
<td>$503</td>
<td>$437</td>
<td>$418</td>
<td>$645</td>
<td>$2,775</td>
<td>$2,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small County Outreach Program</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Starts Transit Program</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$409</td>
<td>$409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Infrastructure Bank</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transp Regional Incentive Program</td>
<td>$96</td>
<td>$381</td>
<td>$137</td>
<td>$137</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>$1,021</td>
<td>$925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$439</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,116</strong></td>
<td><strong>$744</strong></td>
<td><strong>$679</strong></td>
<td><strong>$663</strong></td>
<td><strong>$890</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,532</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,092</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Growth Management Funds—Tentative Work Program

Growth Management Programs
6-Year Total ($ millions)

- Transp Regional Incentive Program
  - $1,020.6
  - 23%

- State Infrastructure Bank
  - $100.0
  - 2%

- New Starts Transit Program
  - $409.0
  - 9%

- Small County Outreach Program
  - $202.1
  - 4%

- County Incentive Grant Program
  - $25.0
  - 1%

- Strategic Intermodal System
  - $2,775.0
  - 61%
SB 360 vs. Tentative Program

Growth Management Funding Levels
Estimated Project Commitments vs. Tentative Work Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimated Project Commitments</th>
<th>Programmed Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ Millions
Growth Management Product & Product Support Funding

Growth Management by Program Plan Group
6-Year Total ($ millions)

- Product: $3,759.4 (83%)
- Product Support: $771.4 (17%)
- Other/Micellaneous: $0.9 (0%)

Legend:
- Laplace (brown): Product Support
- Transpose (purple): Other/Micellaneous
- Acorps (blue): Product
Growth Management by Phase

6-Year Total ($ millions)

- **RIGHT OF WAY**
  - $897.5 (24%)

- **CONSTRUCTION**
  - $2,122.8 (57%)

- **OPERATIONS**
  - $53.5 (1%)

- **CAPITAL**
  - $682.7 (18%)

- **PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING**
  - $1.2 (0%)

- **PD & E**
  - $1.8 (0%)

**Growth Management Funding by Phase**
Growth Management Funding – Comparison to Total Work Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Work Program</th>
<th>Growth Management</th>
<th>Growth Mgt. as a % of Total Work Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$9,865,575,551</td>
<td>$439,421,131</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$8,969,393,094</td>
<td>$1,115,658,865</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$7,436,272,665</td>
<td>$744,442,685</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$6,712,758,045</td>
<td>$678,686,100</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$6,639,862,122</td>
<td>$663,039,380</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$7,130,391,659</td>
<td>$890,448,480</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Total</td>
<td>$36,888,677,585</td>
<td>$4,092,275,510</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Growth Management Product Funding

**Background**

**Policy Analysis**

**Work Program**

### Total Work Program Product vs. Growth Management Product (2006-2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Work Program Product</th>
<th>Growth Management Product</th>
<th>Growth Management Product as a % of Work Program Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$6,589,096,847</td>
<td>$368,233,628</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$6,319,217,117</td>
<td>$953,020,236</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$4,991,513,532</td>
<td>$587,754,590</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$4,449,858,322</td>
<td>$544,536,442</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$4,540,557,194</td>
<td>$552,843,397</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$4,954,261,913</td>
<td>$753,040,685</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Total</td>
<td>$25,255,408,078</td>
<td>$3,391,195,350</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Growth Management Product vs. Total Work Program Product**

- **Total Work Program Product**
- **Growth Management Product**

**5-Year Total**

- $25,255,408,078
- $3,391,195,350
- 13.4%
Work Program Findings

- On a five-year basis, the FDOT Work Program has grown from the Adopted level of $34.4 billion to $36.9 billion in the Tentative Program, for an increase of $2.5 billion.

- On a five-year basis, funding for total transportation product has grown by slightly over 13% from the Adopted Program to the Tentative Program.

- The FDOT Tentative Work Program provides $4.5 billion to Growth Management programs on a six-year basis, from FY 2006 to FY 2011, and $4.1 billion for the period of 2007-2011.
Work Program Findings

- 61% of the Growth Management funding is allocated to Strategic Intermodal System improvements and 23% is dedicated to the Transportation Regional Incentive Program.
- Almost all Growth Management funding is committed to Product and Product Support activities, with Product accounting for 83% of the total Growth Management.
- The new Growth Management funds represent 11.1% of the overall FDOT Tentative Work Program from FY 2007 to FY 2011 and 13.4% of the transportation product for the same period.
Questions