

Transportation Stakeholders Group (TSG)

Meeting 2 – May 28, 2014 1 pm to 4:30 pm





Welcome

Safety Moment



Meeting Purpose

- Consider plan issues identified by public input to date
- Review and consider Alaska transportation system performance emphasis
- Review and input on plan goals, strategies, and actions to consider





Agenda

Welcome

- Introductions
- Safety moment

Presentations

- Review of input to date
- Aviation analysis update
- Baseline condition update
- Near term project plans (CIP)

Group discussion

- Scenarios
- Plan emphasis areas
- Consideration of plan strategies and actions
- Next steps





Input to Date



Previous TSG Meeting Input (1 of 2)

- We need to consider the big picture—how transportation and other infrastructure needs intersect
- A plan is only as good as its implementation strategy
 - Goals, strategies and policies should advise overall direction
 - Performance measures and targets should be defined
- Maintenance of existing infrastructure is a huge issue across all modes
 - Backlog creates further problems "down the road"
 - Funding constraints are growing



Previous TSG Meeting Input (2 of 2)

- Safety, Congestion (not necessarily rush-hour congestion), and Connectivity are key focus points today—and in the future
- Future conditions show great challenges (funding) and great opportunity (e.g., Arctic development)
- Transit, public transportation, and non-motorized transportation need a larger role in the plan



Other Input to Date (1 of 2)

- Maintain, preserve and upgrade existing system first
- Build new roads/ access and expand the existing system
- Don't start so many mega projects "most of which do not go farther than the planning stages and are a drain on funding"
- Provide better freight and passenger service to rural communities, especially harbor and airport improvements
- Strong interest in growing transit service

3 public open houses (100 people) | 103 online comments (28 individuals)



Other Input to Date (2 of 2)

- Add safety improvements such as more sidewalks and bike paths
- Propose projects that have public support
- Consider long-term fiscal costs and benefits before starting a project
- Climate change
 - Account for climate change risks such as warming/thawing permafrost, increased flooding, and increased coastal erosion
- Accessibility
 - Need to ensure accessibility needs are properly addressed
- Other agencies' roles
 - AIDEA, others





Baseline Conditions Update

Preliminary Data, Work in Progress



Alaska Aviation System Overview

- There are over 730 airports in Alaska
- 82% are not connected to the road network
- 254 are owned by DOT&PF
 - Of these, 252 are part of the Rural Airport System
 - 45 Paved runway
 - 1 Concrete
 - 34 Seaplane
 - 169 Gravel

Other public airports owned by municipalities or federal government

	Airport	Seaplane	Heliport
Public	290	86	12
Private	241	43	29
Military	20	0	1
Total	550	129	42



Alaska Aviation Funding (1 of 2)

- One of only two states that have no dedicated Statefunded transportation fund or user fees.
- The FAA's Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funds the large majority of Alaska's aviation capital improvement program
- Alaska receives the highest federal transportation funding (for aviation) per capita of any state
- Cuts in AIP funds are a major risk



Alaska Aviation Funding (2 of 2)

- Federal funding is primary source of funds
 - Airport and Airways Trust Fund (AATF) funded by various aviation fees (detailed below) from aviation-related excise taxes and fees on passengers, cargo, and fuel.
 - In addition to the airport improvement program (AIP), AATF also provides over two-thirds of funding for the FAA.

Federal spending on the FAA is outpacing AATF revenue

- General fund dollars have made up difference every year since 2000, but are tightening
- In the past 11 years, the FAA over-forecast trust fund revenues by \$9.34 billion, according to a GAO report.
- This has led to a minimal uncommitted balance of AATF funds
 - Situation is forecast to improve in near future (see chart below)



Alaska Aviation Funding: AIP Funding

In 2013, expenditures dropped below \$200 M





Alaska Aviation Funding: Passenger Facility Charge

- Five Alaskan airports are collecting passenger facility charge (PFC) funds to pay for capital projects
 - These fees are charged per boarding passenger and collected by airlines

Airport	PFC Level	Total Approved	Estimated Final Collection
Anchorage	\$3.00	\$91.243.173	12/1/2026
		400.047.000	40/4/2020
Fairbanks	\$4.50	\$33,217,000	10/1/2026
Juneau	\$4.50	\$15,211,781	5/1/2017
Ketchikan	\$4.50	\$6,644,400	4/1/2018
Sitka	\$4.50	\$1,365,000	9/1/2013



Aviation Needs: *Primary Airport Entitlements*

- 29 Alaska airports qualified for primary entitlements in FY 2014
- However several are just above the 10,000 enplaned passenger minimum for primary entitlement funding

Locid	City	Airport Name	CY 2012 Enplanements	FY 2014 Entitlement
ANC	Anchorage	Ted Stevens Anchorage International	2,249,717	\$ 3,117,529
FAI	Fairbanks	Fairbanks International	450,436	\$ 3,122,267
JNU	Juneau	Juneau International	353,048	\$ 2,615,850
BET	Bethel	Bethel	148,168	\$ 1,550,474
KTN	Ketchikan	Ketchikan International	103,136	\$ 1,316,307
ENA	Kenai	Kenai Municipal	99,955	\$ 1,299,532
ADQ	Kodiak	Kodiak	78,749	\$ 1,078,990
SIT	Sitka	Sitka Rocky Gutierrez	68,222	\$ 1,000,000
OTZ	Kotzebue	Ralph Wien Memorial	63,032	\$ 1,000,000
OME	Nome	Nome	59,807	\$ 1,000,000
SCC	Deadhorse	Deadhorse	43,837	\$ 1,000,000
BRW	Barrow	Wiley Post-Will Rogers Memorial	43,673	\$ 1,000,000
CDV	Cordova	Merle K (Mudhole) Smith	16,061	\$ 1,000,000
ANI	Aniak	Aniak	15,220	\$ 1,000,000
GAL	Galena	Edward G. Pitka Sr	14,563	\$ 1,000,000
UNK	Unalakleet	Unalakleet	13,070	\$ 1,000,000
KSM	St Mary's	St Mary's	12,711	\$ 1,000,000
MBA	Manokotak	Manokotak	12,363	\$ 1,000,000
WRG	Wrangell	Wrangell	11,434	\$ 1,000,000
YAK	Yakutat	Yakutat	10,100	\$ 1,000,000
HNS	Haines	Haines	10,093	\$ 1,000,000



Aviation Needs: *Primary Entitlements*

- Several airports have crossed between primary and nonprimary (10,000 enplanements) in the recent past
- More airports competing for the same pot of money

Airport	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Anchorage Lake Hood	23,647	15,184	15,018	7,575	23,497	21,033
Anchorage Merrill Field	9,204	15,206	14,769	14,972	23,344	20,163
Petersburg	20,543	19,901	17,988	18,468	18,318	18,800
Valdez	16,225	14,981	14,363	15,739	16,147	16,087
Cordova	16,759	16,640	15,372	17,856	17,731	16,061
Aniak	23,803	18,526	16,255	16,394	16,217	15,220
Galena	8,909	7,784	7,447	12,421	10,862	14,563
Unalakleet	11,249	12,327	10,571	12,693	12,332	13,070
St Mary's	14,258	9,808	7,213	9,891	12,415	12,711
Manokotak	10,869	13,393	13,570	12,409	11,828	12,363
Wrangell	11,588	10,601	10,790	10,882	11,674	11,434
Yakutat	11,443	11,028	12,158	10,035	10,517	10,100
Haines	7,554	7,035	7,099	9,534	8,618	10,093
Emmonak	12,638	9,097	9,872	10,537	9,174	9,854
Hoonah	8,482	7,680	7,651	10,759	10,815	9,564
Gustavus	5,197	11,828	8,822	9,996	11,537	9,509
Cold Bay	8,721	9,105	8,968	9,261	9,395	9,463
Fort Yukon	9,085	8,298	7,738	7,986	9,444	7,948
Skagway	13,156	10,727	6,468	8,531	8,244	7,532
Iliamna	8,153	9,545	7,240	6,889	7,396	7,036
Quinhagak	7,373	6,950	6,387	6,770	6,392	6,583
Chevak	4,641	4,741	5,507	5,588	5,578	5,559



Aviation Needs: *Planned Expenditures*



Airport Needs Pilot Program

- Proof-of-concept to identify 20-year airport needs
- Goals
 - Provide systematic, trackable, comprehensive, updatable and transparent process regarding airport needs
 - Centralize data storage
 - Allow stakeholder input
- Methodology:
 - Develop checklists of that can be used at all types of airports
 - Developed tablet input program that links with AASP website
 - Interview local airport users/carriers
 - Develop data needs list for each airport with cost estimates
 - ASAP, short-term, mid-term, and long-term needs
- Pilot competed in 2013 at 18 Airports
- Scheduled to be completed at all Alaska airports



Airport Needs Pilot Results

- Identified over \$1 billion in needs at 18 airports
 - Over \$78 million ASAP
 - Nearly \$350 million Short-term
- Identified funding eligibility
 - Nearly all AIP eligible (only about \$9 million state and local)
- Needs far exceed resources
 - The 18 airports in the pilot collectively received about \$443 million of AIP funds over 30 years from 1982-2012
- Focus should therefore be on preventive maintenance and prioritizing projects
- Recommendations:
 - Complete all DOT&PF airport inspections within 3 years
 - Develop capital improvement maintenance plan for each airport
 - Consider requiring CIMP projects to be nominated for APEB
 - Ensure data available for all airports on AASP website



Alaska VMT and Fuel Consumption



21

Baseline Update: *Pavement Condition*



Higher backlog*

* Based on subset of paved roads data collected in 2009 and 2014



Baseline Update: Pavement Condition (NHS)





- Condition worse than in 2009*
- Higher backlog*

* Based on subset of paved roads data collected in 2009 and 2014



Baseline Update: *Bridge Condition*

Number of bridges, structurally deficient (SD) bridges





Preliminary Capital Improvement Plan (1 of 3)

- 10-year plan includes:
 - 4-year STIP
 - Committed projects planned for construction within 10 years



* Work in progress – currently reviewing needs numbers in each region

25

Preliminary Capital Improvement Plan (2 of 3)

Representative projects*

- Knik Arm Crossing
- Seward highway reconstruction (multiple)
- Glenn highway reconstruction (multiple)
- Tustumena replacement¹
- Southeast mainliner (Alaska class ferries)¹
- Parks highway reconstruction (multiple)
- Dalton highway corridor surface repairs
- Juneau Access
- JNU W Egan Dr Corridor Improvements: McNugget to Vintage Blvd
- Anchorage: Midtown congestion relief
- Total Needs over next 10 years: Over \$8.5 billion

* Not a comprehensive list, in no particular order ¹ Not included in \$8.5 billion needs estimate



Preliminary Capital Improvement Plan (3 of 3)



Emerging Conclusions

- Growing backlog of pavement needs
- Bridge preservation is consistent
- Airport investments need to be aligned with goals/priorities, focus on maintenance/preservation
- Funding uncertainties more significant than in the past
- CIP needs account for over 10 years worth of projects

- Based on historical revenues



Emerging Performance Gaps

- Significant preservation backlog, with NHS gaining higher visibility
- Need to account for growth in urban centers
- Need to keep up with connectivity needs





Discussion

Policies, Strategies and Actions



Scenarios to Plan for

Preservation

- Growing backlog
- System development
 - Current CIP commits the 10-year emphasis
- Travel demand
 - High demand in largest urban areas
 - Potential for new freight demands
- Finance
 - No increase in Federal funding levels
 - Tough competition with other needs for state funds
- Intergovernmental collaboration for large projects
 - Primary growth areas, others



What Should Statewide Plan Emphasize?

- Given the scenarios, what should the statewide plan emphasize?
 - Focus areas?
 - Priorities?
- Where should additional revenues focus?



Current Plan Policies

System development

- Multimodal transportation system, including accessibility/mobility and freight movement
- System preservation
 - Apply good life cycle management practices
- System management and operations
 - Efficient management of system to achieve better operation

- Economic development
 - Through new facilities and system preservation
- Safety
 - All modes
- Security
 - Inter-agency collaboration
- Environment and quality of life
 - Preserve ecosystems
 - Energy conservation
- Good government
 - Analytical framework to set priorities



What is the LRTP?

 Provide strategies and actions to link the plan to other detailed plans/goals (e.g. regional plans, strategic plan, performance measures)





What's Covered in the LRTP (And What Isn't)

The plan will

- Align with state's policy direction
- Be system level
- Address all modes
- Address DOT&PF responsibilities as the owner
- Identify priorities
- Set performance measures
- Meet State and Federal requirements

Will not

- List all projects
- Be unrealistic
- Too general
- Identify specific costs
- Identify local transportation priorities



Plan Strategies

Prioritize needs

Manage for results

Constrain needs

Increase revenues

Given the trends and scenarios:

- Do these still apply?
- What should we add/modify?
- What is most important?



Strategy: Prioritize needs

- Existing Preservation emphasis
 - Prioritize between/within categories of need
 - Revisit and prioritize system plans
- Other actions?



Strategy: Manage for results

- Align programs and budgets with policy goals
 - MAP-21, Performance measures
- Apply life cycle management best practices
 - Improved systems, treatment considerations
- Implement pavement management system analytical capabilities
- Implement new technologies
- Overall plan investment emphasis?



Strategy: Constrain needs

- Emphasize National Highway System (NHS)
- Preserve transportation corridors in high growth areas
- Pursue demand management and multimodal solutions
- Other actions to consider?





- Pursue state funding mechanisms
- Others: tolling, traffic impact fees
- What actions should the state pursue?



Next Steps

- Technical work to:
 - Validate needs for all modes
 - Detail performance of system when CIP is built out
- Establish draft plan scenario, goals, strategies and actions





Questions/Comments

