

Draft Ten Year Plan Summary

1. The previous/current 2009-2018 Ten Year Plan deferred or eliminated approximately **\$1.7 B** of projects to produce a reasonably financially constrained plan with: **\$2.3B project Costs vs. \$2.1 B anticipated revenue (approximately \$195M over programmed)**.
2. The Draft 2011-2020 Ten Year Plan continues the priorities brought forward from past Ten Year Plans while attempting to maintain the fiscal discipline.
3. No new projects (other than the Stewartstown red-listed, down-posted bridge) were proposed to be added. Existing preservation programs, emphasis on replacing/repairing red list bridges, and the Salem-Manchester I-93 rebuilding would continue.
4. There is no State (hard) match to federal funds in the 2010-2011 State budget, Turnpike Toll Credit is applied instead. The \$130M Economic Stimulus funding offsets this impact in the biennium.
5. The draft Ten Year Plan was based on very conservative financial assumptions including the continued application of Turnpike Toll Credit for State (hard) match through the ten years of the plan. The Draft plan contains:
\$2.41 B project costs vs. \$2.12 B anticipated revenue (\$290M over programmed).
6. There have been a number of additional priority capital needs identified through the GACIT process that lack sufficient funding. In addition to these specific projects, there is also need for increased investment in preservation efforts such as replacement of culverts, remediation of rock slopes, rehabilitation/reclamation of pavement structures too far gone for resurfacing (notably secondary State Roads), urban compact areas, posted bridges, etc.
7. The Draft Ten Year Plan is over programmed by \$285M, a \$90M increase over the previous/current Ten Year Plan. This negative trend tends to undermine the intent of maintaining a financially credible plan.
8. Given the above it is difficult to consider adding projects to the Draft Ten Year Plan to address the identified priority needs.
9. The GACIT process has identified and established project needs and priorities. The additional project priorities that lack sufficient funding are a revenue issue, which is not and should be forwarded to the HB2 Highway Finance Commission and the Legislature for consideration of funding needs.
10. There are a number of future funding sources that may be considered by the HB2 Highway Finance Commission including:
 - Re-establishing the State (hard) match to the federal program (approx. \$150m+).
 - An alternative way of funding the I-93 project (demonstration toll project or other dedicated revenue could address approx. \$195m currently contingent on GARVEE bonds and \$260M currently unfunded improvements including Exit 4A).
 - Or other revenue enhancements.