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New Federal Legislation - Current Status

- SAFETEA-LU Expired September 30, 2009
  - On 2nd 30/31 day extension (Had 12 before SAFETEA-LU passed)
- Obama Administration seeking 18-month extension, with Policy
- Senate pushing for “clean” 18-month extension
  - Pushing 6-month extension as compromise
- Oberstar – proposed 6-year $450B bill plus $50B for High Speed and Intercity Passenger Rail
  - Not supporting 6-month extension
- Latest discussion -- reauthorization as economic stimulus (Maybe front-loaded)
Funding

- Highway Trust Fund is Broke!
  - $8 Billion shortfall in 2008
  - $7 Billion shortfall in FY09
  - Will need another $8-10B for FY10
- Gas Tax not the long-term funding source.
  - Not indexed for inflation
  - Fuel efficiency erodes funding capacity of gas tax
  - $236 B in revenues projected for next six years
- VMT being explored as a replacement for gas tax
FDOT priorities

- Funding Equity
- Flexibility
- Innovation Financing and Partnerships
- Defining role of State, federal and local/MPOs in delivering federal transportation system
Redefining Role/Purpose of Federal Act

• Not just a highway bill – Looking beyond the Interstate System
• Mode Neutral
  • Freight
  • Transit
  • High Speed/Intercity Rail
• Urban Issues/ “Livability”
  • Metro Mobility ("Blueprint") plans
Performance-Based Planning

• Concept:
  • Streamline program structure
  • Accountability through performance measures
  • Greater transparency

• Issues:
  • States need flexibility
  • What will targets be and who will set them?
  • Sufficient, uniform and reliable data
  • Tie to funding? Rewards or Sanctions?
  • Application at project or program level
  • Transition
Obama Administration

- Seeking 18-month extension – “Stage I Reauthorization”
  - Funding for data collection and analysis to support performance measures.
  - Development of guidelines for Regional Access and Mobility Plans and “Livability” Initiative.
- Expected priorities:
  - High Speed and Intercity Passenger Rail
  - Projects of National Significance (ARRA Tiger Grants as model)
  - National Infrastructure Bank
Senate

• S. 1036 -- “Federal Surface Transportation Policy and Planning Act of 2009”
  • Outlines objectives and goals for the national transportation system.

  • VMT reduction (per capita)
  • Reduce fatalities
  • Reduce CO2
  • Reduce transportation delays (per capita)
  • Increase “state of good repair”
  • Increase public transportation – transit/HSR/Intercity rail
  • Increase non-hwy freight

• Reduce freight and passenger delays at international points of entry
• Ensure transport of domestic energy supplies
• Reduce transportation related share of GDP

- $450 Billion over 6 years (additional $50B for High Speed and Intercity Passenger Rail)
- Cannot assess equity – incomplete program allocations and no formulas
- Focus on system preservation and maintenance
- More federal control over project selection (Discretionary Grants)
- More funding for transit and passenger rail
- Extensive Performance Measures
- National Infrastructure Bank
Climate Change/State (2008/09)

- MPOs should:
  - Minimize GHG emissions
  - Consider strategies for integrating transportation/land use planning – sustainable development/reduce GHG
- Requires energy considerations be included in all state, regional and local planning
- Changes to growth management:
  - Energy efficient land use, reducing GHG emissions
  - Transportation concurrency
Energy and Climate Change Action Team’s recommendations

- Dec. 2010 – amend Florida Transportation Plan to address climate change, reducing GHG emissions, providing modal alternatives
- July 2010 – modify the Efficient Transportation Decision Making process to include climate change considerations
- July 2010 – identify programs funding capacity improvement, add GHG emissions to funding criteria
- FDOT/DEP work with USDOT/EPA to improving modeling tools
- By 2015 – develop plan to seek additional funding to remove freight bottlenecks (e.g. SIS connector routes)
- State, regional & local governments and modal partners: cooperatively identify infrastructure
Climate Change/Federal

- Overlap of climate and transportation bills
  - Both include changes to transportation planning process
- Climate bill moving faster (so far)
- House – H.R. 2454 (Waxman-Markey) passed, section 222 addresses transportation planning
- Senate – climate change recently introduced
Waxman-Markey (section 222) and House T&I climate provisions virtually identical, key provisions:

- Scope of planning process for state DOTs and MPOs expanded:
  - Sustainability and livability, reduce surface transportation GHG and dependence on foreign oil, adapting to climate change
- State DOTs and TMAs: Planning process must include transportation related GHG reduction targets and strategies
  - Report on progress: sustaining/reducing GHG (transp. related)
    - Include efforts to increase transit ridership and travel by walking, biking and other non-motorized transport
  - Models/methodology: determined by EPA
Climate Change/Federal

- Waxman-Markey key provisions, continued
  - USDOT establishes performance measures, includes:
    - LRTP: reduces surface transportation GHG and energy consumption
    - Additional measures for large MPOs (>1 million), at min. the LRTP developed via assessment of various measures such as:
      - Land use patterns supporting mobility and reduced SOV trips
      - Reducing GHG emissions
    - State DOTs and MPOs establish performance targets and report progress annually
Climate Change/Federal

- Senate Clean Energy Jobs and American Power Act introduced (sections 112 and 113) – similarities to House bills:
  - States and MPOs address GHG emission: planning process, reduction targets and strategies
  - Would require EPA to establish standardized emissions models and methodologies for states and MPOs
- Some differences between House bills
  - Require states/MPOs submit long range plans for review to USDOT and EPA for approval (re: likely achieving targets)
  - Includes transportation grant programs (Transit funding)
  - E.g. grants for developing GHG reduction plans (only MPOs) and implement strategies (states and MPOs)
Mobility Fee Study/State

- SB 360 eliminated transportation concurrency requirements for “Dense Urban Land Areas”
- Removed DRI requirements for DULAs
- Directed DCA and FDOT to conduct study and provide joint report report to Legislature by December 1, 2009 that evaluates a Mobility Fee to replace the existing transportation concurrency system
Mobility Fee (Cont.)

- SB 360 – Mobility Fee Should:
  - Provide for mobility
  - Developments mitigate impacts proportional to those impacts
  - Fairly distribute fee
  - Promote compact, mixed-use and energy efficient development
Mobility Fee (Cont.)

- Mobility Fee Needs a Mobility Plan
  - Land use and transportation are closely related
  - Density and transit are linked
  - Serve as cost basis for mobility fee
  - At minimum county-wide
    - Option: regional mobility plan
Mobility Fee (cont.)

- Mobility Fee is not a VMT tax – this is a federal issue being discussed as a long-term replacement for the gas tax.
- Recommended mobility fee will be based off projected VMT generation according to location and type of development.
- Key issues:
  - Governance
  - Role of mobility planning
  - Fee Methodology
  - Implementation timeline
Any Questions?