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The Honorable Ruth Ann Minner
Governor, State of Delaware
Tatnall Building
William Penn Street, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Floor
Dover, DE 19901
Dear Governor Minner:
On behalf of the Transportation Development and Funding Options Task Force, established under your Executive Order 69, I am pleased to submit our final report regarding optional annual Capital Transportation Program funding levels and potential funding options to achieve those annual levels.

Since our first meeting in June 2005, the Task Force members have reviewed the Transportation Trust Fund historical and future revenue and expenditure projections. The Task Force has also examined details of DelDOT's updated 2005-2010 CTP and projects authorized in the Fiscal Year 2006 Bond and Capital Improvements Act. The members used this information to project a funding gap in the Transportation Trust Fund; this report includes a range of options to address these funding needs. Finally, the Task Force developed a number of financial recommendations, some of which are currently being implemented, to improve management of revenues and expenditures, to better align authorizations and spending and to facilitate the exchange of financial data between DelDOT, other offices of the Executive and Legislative branches.

I want to thank each of the Task Force participants and many members of their staffs for their dedicated time and energy. Together they have made the job of evaluating this extremely complex and important matter a very worthwhile undertaking. I believe that the Task Force has identified a useful list of potential solutions.

All of us are concerned about the long-term health of the Transportation Trust Fund and its ability to finance much needed improvements in our rapidly growing state. I look forward to reviewing this Task Force report with you and members of the $143^{\text {rd }}$ General Assembly.


Nathan Hayward, III
Secretary
Department of Transportation
Task Force Chairman
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## Executive Summary

On June 1, 2005 Governor Ruth Ann Minner signed Executive Order Number 69 establishing a Task Force to recommend options for providing short and long-term resources to the Transportation Trust Fund ("TTF"), created in 1987 as the method through which the state would funnel all of its transportation investments. The Task Force was composed of 15 members representing the Delaware General Assembly, the Office of the Governor, various state agencies and members of the private sector. A copy of the Executive Order is enclosed at Appendix A and the list of members at Appendix B.

The Governor's directive spoke to the need for a comprehensive review of transportation demands, and the funds (both short and long term) available and required to meet those stated needs. Predictability and stability of funding have been hallmarks of Delaware's transportation financing for more than a decade, and as the state continues to grow, these attributes need to be addressed by public and private policy makers. Long term transportation investments/capital acquisitions require careful planning, including plentiful community participation, designs which achieve the best value and public acceptance over the long term, and construction/purchase which meets or exceeds both state and federal quality standards.

The Executive Order recognized the need for solutions to address funding shortfalls that have occurred for a variety of reasons including unprecedented traffic growth, limited resources, substantial cost increases related to construction, and use of TTF funds for economic development initiatives. It also highlighted the need for predictable and sustainable funding to improve and maintain Delaware's transportation system.

The Task Force evaluated three capital spending program scenarios ranging from a continuation of the existing core business program, which assumes current funding levels, to a capital spending program which maximizes the Department's capital spending given departmental and construction industry capacity. A third capital spending program, offering an intermediate option was also evaluated.

For the period Fiscal Year 2007-2012, an analysis of each of these scenarios provides a range of total capital spending from $\$ 1.7$ billion to $\$ 4.4$ billion. The resulting additional annual revenue requirements to fund these capital spending programs range from $\$ 0$ to $\$ 129.2$ million in Fiscal Year 2007 and from \$59.5 million to \$480.4 million in Fiscal Year 2012.

The Task Force developed a list of options to address the current TTF financial dilemma. The options include (but are not limited to):

- Increasing one or more of the traditional trust fund revenues (tolls, gas taxes, DMV fees);
- Creating new fees payable by the general public and/or the user public and/or those parties (particularly private developers) whose projects both benefit from, and place new demands on, the state's transportation system;
- Increasing the TTF's borrowing program;
- Transferring additional DelDOT operating costs from the TTF back to the General Fund, over an extended period of time;
- Delaying and/or de-authorizing some portion of the existing capital projects included in the six-year plan;
- Using one or more techniques of innovative transportation financing (e.g. a lease concession on existing/to be built toll roads) with appropriate oversight of any proposed transaction by Executive and Legislative leaders

The Task Force also developed a list of internal and external controls that will more accurately reflect the Department's current and future spending requirements thereby providing policymakers with a better understanding of potential Trust Fund revenue needs. The Department also plans to provide monthly expenditure updates to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of the Controller General and the Department of Finance to ensure accurate revenue to expenditure ratios.

Internal controls include the use of new accounting computer systems, an improved system for providing communication between DelDOT and other state agencies, and monthly expenditure reviews. The external controls recommended include a regular review of expenditure estimates by an independent body and the institution of program limits to make estimates more meaningful.

## I. Problem Statement

## A. Fast Growing Demand for Transportation Investments

Over the past decade, Delaware has experienced an unprecedented growth in population and new residential and commercial development. The changing landscape, particularly in once rural, agricultural portions of southern New Castle and many parts of Kent and Sussex Counties, has helped to produce significant growth in the number of registered vehicles, and an even greater demand on the system for vehicle miles traveled.

Demographic data support the widespread understanding that due to its comparatively low state/local tax burden (now third lowest in the nation), Delaware is becoming an increasingly attractive site for retirees. Sussex County grew at $38 \%$ in the decade 1991-2000, more than twice the statewide average. Particularly low real estate taxes, and still relatively affordable housing away from the beaches in southern Delaware, have helped to support an in-migration of population unseen in Delaware's modern history.

And because of Delaware's geographic location, through traffic along the major interstate and arterial roads continues to build. Three regional north/south alignments (Routes 1, 13, and 113), two major southwest/northeast alignments (the I-95, I-295, I-495 and Route 40 corridors), and at least three north/south arterials (routes 7, 52, and 202) all carry fast growing volumes of passenger cars and commercial traffic moving along and through the Delmarva peninsula. Regional shopping, entertainment, educational and health care institutions located in Delaware continue to draw shoppers, viewers, students, and patients from metropolitan concentrations as far away as Washington, DC; Salisbury, Annapolis, and Baltimore, Maryland; Harrisburg, Lancaster and Philadelphia, PA; and Camden, Trenton, Atlantic City and Newark, NJ.

Delaware offers fixed route transit service that covers much of New Castle County but contains limited routes in Kent and Sussex Counties. Fares are currently well below regional and national levels. But Delaware also offers the most generous paratransit system in the United States, providing pick-up and delivery to all eligible passengers anywhere in the State. Paratransit fares have not been adjusted since 1988. Continued high demand for this service, and fast rising costs of operations, particularly for fuel and labor, have dramatically increased the operating subsidy which DelDOT pays from the TTF to the Delaware Transit Corporation (DTC).

The table below shows a sample of the economic and demographic statistics from which transportation demand emanates:

|  | Percent Change <br> $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}-\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Factors Affecting Transportation | $17.6 \%$ |
| State Population | $16.8 \%$ |
| Employment | $15.5 \%$ |
| Households | $16.3 \%$ |
| Licensed Drivers | $17.8 \%$ |
| Registered Vehicles | $20.8 \%$ |
| Households (2 or more cars) | $23.5 \%$ |
| Trips | $25.2 \%$ |
| Avg. Annual Miles of Travel |  |
| New Infrastructure Provided | $6.8 \%$ |
| Lane Miles | $6.2 \%$ |
| Road Miles |  |

## B. TTF Resources Have Not Kept Pace with Rising Demands and Costs

DelDOT's resources which are available to pay for operations, debt service, and capital investments have not grown as rapidly as either the underlying demand for transportation services nor the unit costs associated with construction and capital equipment. The major sources of revenue (gas taxes, tolls, and motor vehicle fees) have grown with volumes, but are not particularly inflation sensitive. The total growth in resources over the ten-year history of the TTF has been $31 \%$.

During this period, DelDOT made adjustments to the toll schedules on Route I-95 and instituted tolls on the new limited access road SR-1. The State gas tax was raised to its present level in 1995. An increase ( $27 \%$ ) in fixed route transit fares was imposed in 1989. Motor fuel taxes were increased by 1 cent for gasoline and 3 cents for special fuels in January 1995. The most recent toll increase (October 2005) is reflected on Interstate 95 for both passenger and commercial vehicles. Additionally, a significant discount program for commercial vehicles was enacted. With the implementation of EZ Pass on Rt. 1, tolls decreased for frequent users and EZ Pass customers. Document fees were increase in September 1993 from 2\% to 2.75\%. Effective July 2005, vehicle record sales were increased from $\$ 4$ to $\$ 15$ per record and certified documents increased from $\$ 8$ to $\$ 20$.

## C. DelDOT Operating Expenditures Have Increased Faster Than Total Resources

Between FY 1996 and FY 2005, DelDOT’s total Operating Budget (Operations, DTC Transit Subsidy, and Debt Service) grew from $\$ 167$ million to $\$ 303$ million, a total of $\$ 136$ million or $81 \%$. This was more than twice as fast as the growth in Total Resources (31\%) documented in Appendix C. Appendix D provides details on the ten-year expenditure history.

This growth can be attributed to several factors including the transfer of the management and operating costs for the Division of Motor Vehicles from the General Fund to the TTF at the time (FY 2004) that the former Department of Public Safety was reorganized. The growth in the DTC transit subsidy, as discussed in section A above, the implementation of a customer service for EZ Pass, upgrades to the state's network of "intelligent" traffic signals, the mandates of the federal Clean Air Act, salary adjustments, overtime costs resulting from weather emergencies, and energy and fuel costs are other contributing factors.

To offset some of these increases, DelDOT has achieved some major savings through management efforts. The Department has implemented a system-wide investment in EZ Pass technology, an investment which has enabled the Department to handle growing volumes of toll traffic with no increase in personnel. Almost all of the 12,000 traffic signals have been outfitted with LED lenses which save both energy and manpower. The DTC has eliminated commercial workers compensation coverage in favor of joining the State's self-insured Workers Compensation Fund. Personnel vacancies have been difficult to reduce because, among other factors, the disparity in public vs. private wage scales, but DelDOT transfers all salary savings dollars to the annual snow/emergency contingency lines to reduce the need for supplemental appropriations for this purpose.

## D. Project Scopes and Costs Have Increased Faster than Total Resources

Many DelDOT projects require substantial interaction with the public. Community based working groups help fashion the solution to many investments and which, at times, enlarge; both the scope, and the quality of proposed improvements. Examples of project creep abound, but it is accurate to state that in recent years the Department has emphasized the concept of doing the project "right" the first time in order to achieve community consensus faster and to be able to accomplish the project mission with a minimum of community acrimony. The result may be a "better" project, but one that exceeds the original project cost.

Elsewhere we have alluded to the dramatic increase in the costs of construction labor and materials. However, an increasingly troublesome development has been the staggering increase in the price of real estate required for construction rights-of-way. All over the state, DelDOT is now paying prices for even small slivers of land at prices unthinkable even a few years ago. Projects in some portions of the state (Sussex and Southern New Castle Counties) present DelDOT with a firstever set of conundrums - the prices for rights-of-way will meet or exceed the costs of construction of a project.

## E. The Current Process of Project Authorizations, Followed by Uncertain Spending Trends, Can Lead to a Build-Up of Authorized but Unexpended Projects

DelDOT is unique among all state agencies in that it must attempt to forecast many difficult outcomes in order to build a proposed planning, design, and construction/acquisition program. Federal law requires transportation departments to plan over a rolling three-year cycle for the projects which will incorporate federal funds. Delaware state law requires a six-year plan, known as the Capital Transportation Plan (CTP), for all capital activities. Many community groups and two federally recognized Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) participate in the drafting and
approval of the so-called "pipeline" of projects. Because of the length of time required for many of these efforts, it is not unusual for an MPO to express differing priorities over the life of any given project. Fast paced economic growth in many parts of Delaware now renders more traditional planning methods obsolete. Hence, what may have been a community's top priority in 2000 can quickly become a "should" or a "nice", following a new "must" that has emerged as the most pressing transportation issue to be resolved. Depending on the nature of the original priorities, communities in recent years have seen their wish lists change before a previous priority has been completed. A good example in Dover was the emergence of the Route 8 connection to SR-1. For years it appeared on Dover's planning list, but not until 2001 did it vault to the top priority for the Dover/Kent County MPO. A number of other important projects in and around Dover were therefore reordered in order to make room for the cost of constructing this new access within a short period of time.

In addition, DelDOT's mix of annual projects ranges from the very simple and straightforward, to the very complex and difficult to forecast. Because state law requires a project authorization before DelDOT may spend state funds, the department attempts to predict over a long period of time the amounts of these authorizations that will be required. However, depending on the nature of the project, the actual expenditure of these funds may vary greatly in both time, and amount in which project authorization and its associated expenditure will not align perfectly each fiscal year.

The amounts and timing of federal participation are equally complex and uncertain. Delaware receives formula authorizations from FHWA each year, but also is the beneficiary of annual "earmark" appropriations. Building and balancing a multi-year federal obligation plan is a very difficult, and dynamic process. If a project for which federal funds are planned runs into delays, DelDOT must be in a position to substitute another federal eligible project in its place in order to prevent the federal funds from lapsing. Delaware has never lapsed federal spending authority, and because it has been both nimble and well positioned, it has benefited each summer by the receipt of varying amounts of additional federal funds which are re-apportioned by the FHWA from other states which have lapsed a portion of their federal funds.

## F. Without Structural Changes in Both Resources and Expenses, DelDOT's Capital Program Will Decline Dramatically and The State will be Unable to Provide the Core Business Program and/or Lapse Available Federal Funds.

The following table provides a summary of the current revenue projections, operating and debt service costs and the remaining state resources available for capital improvements. The addition of available federal funds results in the total capital program, which, as noted by the table, is projected to decrease over the FY2006 to FY2012 period.

The table also illustrates that operating and debt service costs increase faster than the relatively flat revenue sources. The table below is based on the following set of assumptions that more accurately reflect historical operating growth and maintain sound financial parameters, including:

- DelDOT baseline operations will grow at 7\% per year (for FY07 and beyond)
- DTC baseline operations will grow at $7 \%$ per year (for FY07 and beyond)
- There will be a TTF cash balance of $\$ 50$ million to begin each year
- Interest rate assumption at 7\% annually and Debt Service Reserve Fund and Issuance Cost estimated at $7.8 \%$ annual
- There were not Public Private Partnership assumptions
- Maintenance of the current 50/50 pay/go policy

MASTER SPENDING SUMMARY
October 2005

| S in millions | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total State Revenues | 468 | 450 | 425 | 432 | 438 | 445 | 454 |
| - Operating \& Debt Service | 352 | 328 | 351 | 369 | 380 | 392 | 416 |
| Total Available State Revenues | $\mathbf{1 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 8}$ |
| + Bond Proceeds | 150 | 74 | 74 | 64 | 59 | 53 | 39 |
| $=$ Total State Capital Resources | $\mathbf{2 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 7}$ |
| + Federal Funds Available | 235 | $141^{*}$ | 146 | 148 | 153 | 158 | 160 |
| $=$ Total Capital Program | $\mathbf{5 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 7}$ |

*Federal funds decrease due to annual SAFETEA-LU and Earmark Appropriations as well as advance construction initiatives.

The revenue projections for FY 2006 - 2012 indicate that with relatively flat revenues and increasing operating responsibilities and costs, the funds remaining for the Capital Program will decrease dramatically from $\$ 501$ million in FY 2006 to $\$ 237$ million in FY 2012 as noted above.

## II. Transportation Trust Fund

## A. Current Resources

The Transportation Trust Fund receives revenues from motor fuel taxes, Delaware Turnpike revenues, Route 1 tolls, motor vehicle document fees and motor vehicle registration fees, miscellaneous sources, and federal funds reserved to support capital projects. The chart below details actual receipts in FY2005 (does not include Federal Apportionment).

## Sources of Revenue <br> Transportation Trust Fund - Fiscal 2005



## Motor Fuel Taxes

Motor fuel tax revenue is derived from taxes imposed by the State on gasoline and special fuels. The current rates are $\$ 0.23$ and $\$ 0.22$ per gallon respectively. Motor fuel tax (excludes motor carrier fees) revenue provided $\$ 113.7$ million ( $27.3 \%$ ) of the TTF resources in fiscal year 2005. The last increase in the motor fuel tax occurred in 1995, and future year projections anticipate a $.9 \%$ annualized growth rate.

## Comparable Tax Rates Levied by Surrounding States

|  | Gas/gallon | Special <br> Fuel/gallon |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Maryland | 0.235 | 0.242 |
| Delaware | 0.23 | 0.22 |
| New Jersey | 0.145 | 0.175 |
| Pennsylvania | 0.30 | 0.364 |
| Virginia | 0.19 | 0.174 |
| New York | 0.232 | 0.215 |

## Tolls

Delaware Turnpike (I-95): The toll and concession revenue from the Delaware Turnpike generates the third largest source of revenue to the TTF, $\$ 60.7$ million ( $14.5 \%$ ) in fiscal year 2005. The Delaware Turnpike is comprised of 11.3 miles of Interstate 95 extending from the Maryland/Delaware Line to north of the 141 interchange. The chart below references the entire length of Interstate 95 - Maryland to Pennsylvania state lines. Tolls are collected near the state line. DelDOT owns restaurants and two service stations which, through contracts with concessionaires, provide additional revenue. The Turnpike restaurants were renovated in 1988 and are operated under a 20-year contract that expires in June 2008.

Effective October 1, 2005, toll rates on the Delaware Turnpike were increased from $\$ 2.00$ to $\$ 3.00$ for two-axle vehicles and from $\$ 6.25$ to $\$ 10.00$ for six-axle vehicles. The Turnpike toll structure includes a discount plan for commercial vehicles (with 3 or more axles) with EZ Pass, involving a $75 \%$ discount for travel between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. The toll increase is projected to generate $\$ 29$ million in FY2006 (partial year) and $\$ 38.5$ million in FY2007.

Delaware Route 1: Route 1 consists of 51 miles of fully controlled access highway extending from the Dover Air Force Base to the interchange with I95 adjacent to the Christiana Mall. Toll operations began in December 1993 at three toll plazas located in central Dover, north Dover at Denny's Road, and south of Smyrna. In November 1999, tolls were implemented south of the C\&D Canal near Boyd's Corner. Tolls vary according to vehicle class and toll plaza location and include EZ Pass discounts that were implemented in October 2000. Route 1 tolls provided $\$ 30.2$ million ( $7.2 \%$ ) to the TTF in fiscal year 2005.

Toll increases on Route 1 require legislative approval. The following chart compares Delaware passenger car toll rates with comparable toll roadways in other states.

## Document Fees

Motor vehicle document fees are collected upon the sale or transfer of any new or used motor vehicle (cars, trucks, tractor trailers, or motorcycles). The document fee, which is based on the vehicle purchase price, is applied at a rate of $2.75 \%$. These fees contributed $\$ 65.7$ million ( $15.7 \%$ ) to the TTF in fiscal year 2005 and are projected to increase annually at $2.8 \%$ in the future. The document fee was last increased from 2\% to 2.75\% in September 1993.

Comparable Fees Levied by Other States

| Maryland | $5.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| New Jersey | $6.0 \%$ |
| Delaware | $2.75 \%$ |
| Pennsylvania | $6.0 \%$ |
| Virginia | $3.0 \%$ |
| New York | $4.25 \%$ |

## Delaware's Toll Rate Comparison



## Registration Fees

Motor vehicle registration fees are paid at the time of application for the registration of a motor vehicle by DelDOT's Division of Motor Vehicles. The revenue to the TTF from this source was $\$ 30.2$ million ( $7.2 \%$ ) in fiscal year 2005 and is projected to increase annually at $1.5 \%$ in the future. Passenger cars have paid $\$ 20$ per year since 1965 while trucks pay according to their weight. On July 1, 1993, the registration fee for commercial vehicles was increased from $\$ 6.00$ to $\$ 9.40$ for each 500 pounds in excess of 5,000 pounds.

## Comparable Fees Levied by Other States

| South Carolina | $\$ 15.00$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Pennsylvania | $\$ 36.00$ |
| Delaware | $\$ 20.00$ |
| Maryland | $\$ 64.00-\$ 90.00$ |
| New Jersey | $\$ 68.50-\$ 81.00$ |
| Minnesota | $\$ 129.00$ |

## Miscellaneous Sources

Miscellaneous transportation revenues include motor carrier registration fees, operator license fees, titling fees, Division of Motor Vehicles record sales, vanity tag fees, and other miscellaneous transportation related revenue. Miscellaneous pledged sources totaled $\$ 24.5$ million ( $5.9 \%$ ) in fiscal year 2005. Miscellaneious non-pledged totaled $\$ 72.4$ million ( $17.3 \%$ ), inclusive of one-time general fund support/pass through totaling $\$ 52.1$ million and expense reimbursement from New Jersey settlement, $\$ 2.7 \mathrm{M}$.

Also included in miscellaneous transportation revenue is $\$ 10$ million in escheat revenue that the General Assembly has transferred to the TTF since fiscal year 2000 (with the exception of fiscal year 2003). It is anticipated that such escheat revenue will be transferred to the TTF in the future.

## Federal Funds

The amounts and timing of federal participation are complex and uncertain. Delaware receives formula authorizations from FHWA each year, but also is the beneficiary of annual "earmark" appropriations. Building and balancing a multi-year federal obligation plan is a very difficult, and dynamic process.

In 2005, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy of Users (SAFETEA-LU) was passed. This legislation authorized federal aid for transportation in all states. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funds support capital transportation improvements. Anticipated highway apportionments from FHWA show a steady increase from $\$ 140$ million in 2007, to $\$ 159.9$ million in 2012. State funds are necessary to match the federal funds at a rate of $20-50 \%$, depending upon the specific program. Approximately $70 \%$ of all Delaware roadways are NOT eligible for federal funding. Specific detail on the federal program and matching is contained in Appendix H .

The 2005 TEA-LU also provided earmarked federal funds for a number of projects throughout the state. These additional federal funds will facilitate the early implementation of a number of these projects. The federal funds will require state matching funds. These matching funds have been incorporated into the Department's projected capital program.

## B. TTF Operating Appropriations

For Fiscal Year 2006, $93.3 \%$ of all operating expenses of the Department of Transportation are funded from the Transportation Trust Fund. These expenses include, but are not limited to, salary and benefit costs of all Department employees, maintenance, toll collections, snow removal, and expenses of the Delaware Transit Corporation.

The Transportation Trust Fund was created in 1987 to provide adequate funding and predictability for the Department's Capital Improvement Program. Beginning in Fiscal Year 1990 and continuing through Fiscal Year 1993, the Department's operating expenses were transferred from the General Fund to the Transportation Trust Fund. During this timeframe, existing transportation-related General Fund revenues (including motor vehicle registration fees, operator license fees and titling fees) were also transferred to the Transportation Trust Fund although at a less than dollar for dollar match.

Additionally, in Fiscal Year 2004, the operations of the Division of Motor Vehicles were transferred to the Trust Fund. In Fiscal Year 2006, $\$ 14$ million in department operations were transferred back to the General Fund. For Fiscal Year 2006, operating expenses funded from the Trust Fund total $\$ 209.2$ million (inclusive of $\$ 14 \mathrm{M}$ general fund support).


## III. Capital Transportation Needs

## A. Revenue Projection Summary

The following table provides a summary of the current revenue projections, operating and debt service cost and the remaining state resources available for capital improvements. The addition of available federal funds results in a total capital program, which, as noted by the table, is projected to decrease over the FY2006 - FY2012 period.

## MASTER SPENDING SUMMARY

October 2005

| S in millions | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total State Revenues | 468 | 450 | 425 | 432 | 438 | 445 | 454 |
| - Operating \& Debt Service | 352 | 328 | 351 | 369 | 380 | 392 | 416 |
| $=$ Total Available State Revenues | $\mathbf{1 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 8}$ |
| + Bond Proceeds | 150 | 74 | 74 | 64 | 59 | 53 | 39 |
| $=$ Total State Capital Resources | $\mathbf{2 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 7}$ |
| + Federal Funds Available | $\mathbf{2 3 5}$ | 141 | 146 | 148 | 153 | 158 | 160 |
| $=$ Total Capital Program | $\mathbf{5 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 7}$ |

## B. Capital Program Components

- A Core Program represents those activities that, for the most part, involve managing and maintaining the Department's most basic existing facilities and services, (i.e. roadway paving, bridge rehabilitation, transportation and transit facilities and the necessary equipment and technology). More detail is included in Appendix F.
- State match for federal funds generally is $20 \%$ but can range as high as $50 \%$ depending on the specific project.
- Federal funds - vary from $80 \%$ to $50 \%$, depending on federal program and must be used in accordance with federal program requirements. Approximately $30 \%$ of Delaware's roads are eligible for federal funding; $70 \%$ are NOT. The Department focuses on using all of its federal funding each year and attempts to secure federal discretionary funds at the end of each federal fiscal year, i.e. funds that are lapsed by other states, to accelerate eligible projects
- $100 \%$ State funded projects - often involve roadways that are NOT eligible for federal funding.


## C. Effect of Funding Shortfall on Program Components

The following table notes the available funds for each component of the capital program.
CAPITAL PROGRAM COMPONENTS

| S in millions | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| State-Core Program | $83^{*}$ | 117 | 120 | 124 | 128 | 132 | 136 |
| + State Match - Federal Funds | 55 | 65 | 83 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 41 |
| + Remaining (100\% State) | 128 | 14 | $(56)$ | $(33)$ | $(49)$ | $(64)$ | $(100)$ |
| $=$ Total State Resources Available | $\mathbf{2 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 7}$ |
| + Federal Funds Available | 235 | 141 | 146 | 148 | 153 | 158 | 160 |
| $=$ Total Capital Program | $\mathbf{5 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 7}$ |

*Core Program was significantly reduced in FY06. Projects for FY07-2012 are based on actual spending history and an annual $3 \%$ growth factor.

A review of the components of the Capital Program indicates,

- No funds are available for $100 \%$ State Funded Capital Projects
- DelDOT will need to reduce its Core Business Program or lapse federal funds
- Reducing the Core Program is highly undesirable since this program includes, for the most part, those most basic activities to manage and maintain DelDOT's existing facilities and services, such as roadway paving, bridge rehabilitation, transit and transportation facilities and the necessary supporting equipment and technology
- Lapsing federal funds is highly undesirable. Delaware has traditionally used $100 \%$ of its apportionment and in fact secured discretionary federal funds at the end of each fiscal year, (i.e., federal funds lapsed by other states).

It is important to note that current revenue estimates would not be adequate to complete entirely all phases of the FY2006 - FY2012 period listed projects. Additional funds from FY2012 and beyond would be required. The exact amounts and timetables will depend on inflation assumptions and revenue levels. Appendix H includes a list of projects contained in the FY2005 FY2010 CTP. This list reflects a total need of $\$ 3.5$ billion.

## IV. Financial Plan Assumptions

In order to assess the revenue requirements of the TTF, the Task Force developed a set of baseline assumptions for the Department's operating and capital programs. Using these assumptions and the resulting funding requirements from an operating and capital perspective, the subcommittee developed a "Maximum Deliverable Program" to address the Department's Capital Transportation Program ("CTP").

## Assumptions - Operating

- Elimination of the Port of Wilmington's annual reimbursement to the TTF (approximately $\$ 2.3$ million annually). This reimbursement stems from a refinancing of a portion of the Port's outstanding debt in Fiscal Year 2002. Analysis of the Port's current and future financial situation indicates TTF reimbursement during the Fiscal 2007-2012 timeframe is unlikely although any change in loan repayment terms must be approved by the General Assembly.
- Annual Departmental operations growth of 7\%. For the past several years, TTF financial plans presented to bond rating agencies have assumed a $4 \%$ growth. Annual growth since fiscal year 1999 has averaged $8.5 \%$.
- Annual Delaware Transit Corporation growth of 7\%. Recent TTF financial plans presented to bond rating agencies have assumed a rate of 5\%. Annual growth since Fiscal Year 1999 has averaged $10.9 \%$.
- Interest rate assumption at 7\% annually and Debt Service Reserve Fund and Issuance Cost estimated at $7.8 \%$ annual
- A $\$ 50$ million working capital cash balance.


## Assumptions - Capital Program

- Annual inflation factor for capital spending of $10 \%$.
- Creation of an Emergency/Contingency allocation to the Capital Spending Program. Such an allocation allows the Department to address such needs without delaying/eliminating on-going projects.
- Does not include Public Private Partnership assumptions
- Maximum spending capacity of $\$ 500$ million for Fiscal Year 2006. This spending represents the limit that existing Department personnel and the local highway construction industry can sustain in FY 2006. Adjusting for the inflation factor and the Emergency/Contingency above yields a Maximum Deliverable Program of \$570 million for Fiscal Year 2007.

Assumptions - Capital Transportation Program Fiscal Year 2007-2012

- Spending for projects previously authorized in the 2005 CTP and prior year CTP's.
- Spending for projects authorized in the Fiscal Year 2006 Bond and Capital Improvements Act. (Outstanding authorizations as of 6/30/06-\$807M) - Reference Appendix F
- Spending on new authorizations required for existing projects based on a particular project's phase (e.g. a project previously authorized for planning now necessitating authorization for right of way acquisition and construction).
- No funding for new projects not previously authorized.

Using the assumptions above, the Task Force developed a "Master Spending Summary" for the period FY 2007 - 2012 outlining the spending capacity associated with the TTF's current Financial Plan/current funding levels ("Core Business/Federal Needs") and the spending capacity associated with the Maximum Deliverable Program. (Refer to Appendix G). This Summary shows the following:

- The Department's Core Business/Federal Needs Program which assumes current funding levels totals $\$ 1.7$ billion (see line 11 of the Master Spending Summary)
- The Maximum Deliverable Program totals $\$ 4.4$ billion (see line 14 )
- A "Funding Gap" of $\$ 2.7$ billion exists between the Core Business/Federal Needs Capital Program and the Maximum Deliverable Program (see line 15).


## V. Capital Program Funding Scenarios

The Task Force requested staff to model three optional annual funding scenarios because the maximum spending alternative represents a significant increase over DelDOT's recent spending experience:

- Minimum (FY07) $\$ 337$ million
- Medium (FY 07) $\$ 450$ million
- Maximum (FY07) $\$ 570$ million

Analysis of each of these scenarios is provided below. Because the Maximum Deliverable Program represents a significant increase over DelDOT's recent capital spending programs, an intermediate program of $\$ 450$ million was also evaluated by the Committee.

## A. Capital Program Scenario Minimum (FY07) - \$337 Million

- Provides funding for Core Business program and State Match for Federal Funds
- This scenario assumes additional revenues ranging from $\$ 30 \mathrm{M}$ to $\$ 65 \mathrm{M}$ annually in the FY2008 - 2012 period, along with increased borrowing.
- Generates a total capital spending program for Fiscal Year 2007-2012 of $\$ 1.7$ billion.
- In Fiscal Year 2007, the $100 \%$ State Funded projects ( $70 \%$ of Delaware lane miles) decreases to $\$ 13.6$ million from $\$ 128.2$ million in Fiscal Year 2003
- In Fiscal Year 2008, no funds are available for $100 \%$ State Funded projects
- Never completes the Fiscal Year 2007-2012 Capital Transportation Program as existing funds are used to meet core business needs and to match Federal authorizations.

In order to fully fund the Department's core business needs and fully match Federal authorizations (e.g. eliminate the $\$ 55.8$ million deficit in Fiscal Year 2008 and the out-year deficits), additional annual revenues are needed as shown in the chart below.

Revenues Required For Core Business/Federal Needs Scenario


## B. Medium Capital Program Scenario (FY07) - \$450 Million

- Generates a total capital spending program for Fiscal Year 2007 - 2012 of $\$ 3.5$ billion.
- Requires additional annual revenues of $\$ 62.4$ million in Fiscal Year 2007 escalating to \$335.2 million in Fiscal Year 2012.
- Fiscal Year 2007-2012 Capital Transportation Program estimated to be completed in Fiscal Year 2015.

Revenues Required For \$450M Capital Program


## C. Maximum Capital Program Scenario (FY07) - $\$ 570$ Million

- Generates a total capital spending program for Fiscal Year 2007-2012 of $\$ 4.4$ billion.
- Requires additional annual revenues of $\$ 129.2$ million in Fiscal Year 2007 escalating to $\$ 480.4$ million in Fiscal Year 2012.
- Fiscal Year 2007-2012 Capital Transportation Program estimated to be completed in Fiscal Year 2013.

Revenues Required For \$570 Capital Program


## VI. Revenue Options

## A. Raise Transportation Revenue

The following revenue options are to be used as examples only. Options may require further review of unit cost and and/or flexible revenue structures.

## Traditional Sources

1. I-95 Toll Options - Raise all axle classes $\$ 1.00$

Revenue Raised: $\$ 29.5$ million
Issues to consider:

- The benefits principle says that those who use the roads should pay for them.
- Ninety percent of the toll is paid by out-of-state residents.
- This toll was just increased effective October, 2005.
- Tolls are regressive; the burden is heavier on low-income users.
- Tolls are an inelastic revenue source; the revenue over time does not grow as rapidly as the costs of transportation programs.
- Toll avoidance may put stress on secondary roads.


## 2. SR 1 Toll Options

## a. Raise toll on all cars $\$ 1.00$

Revenue Raised: $\$ 25.0$ million
Issues to consider:

- The benefits principle says that those who use the roads should pay for them.
- The toll has not been raised since the road opened in 1993.
- The toll charge per mile is amongst the lowest in the country.
- This toll falls more on Delaware residents.
- Tolls are regressive; the burden is heavier on low-income users.
- Tolls are an inelastic revenue source; the revenue over time does not grow as rapidly as the costs of transportation programs.
- Toll avoidance may put stress on secondary roads.
b. Raise toll on all Commercial Vehicles $\mathbf{\$ 1 . 0 0}$ per axle

Revenue Raised: $\$ 4.7$ million
Issues to consider:

- The benefits principle says that those that use the roads should pay for them.
- The toll has not been raised since the road opened in 1993.
- The toll charge per mile is amongst the lowest in the country.
- Commercial vehicles do the greatest damage to the roads.
- Tolls are an inelastic revenue source; the revenue over time does not grow as rapidly as the costs of transportation programs.
- Toll avoidance may put stress on secondary roads.


## c. Eliminate Car EZ Pass Discount

Revenue Raised: $\$ 2.0$ million
Issues to consider:

- It would ease administration and create a clearer toll schedule.
- All road users would be paying the same amount.
- Delaware residents would pay $\$ 0.15$ more per transaction.
- Tolls are regressive; the burden is heavier on low-income users.
- Tolls are an inelastic revenue source; the revenue over time does not grow as rapidly as the costs of transportation programs.
- Toll avoidance may put stress on secondary roads.


## d. Eliminate Commercial EZ Pass Discount

Revenue Raised: $\$ 2.0$ million
Issues to consider:

- It would ease administration and create a clearer toll schedule.
- All users would be paying the same amount.
- Toll avoidance may put stress on secondary roads.


## e. Tie Toll schedule to Price Inflator

Revenue Raised: \$0.6-\$2.0 million
Issues to consider:

- It would provide elasticity to the revenue source.
- There would be yearly expense and timing to adjust the fare schedule.
- Additional revenue yielded is small.


## 3. Increase Motor Fuel Tax 1 cent (both Gas \& Diesel)

Revenue Raised: $\$ 5.0$ million

Issues to consider:

- The benefits principle says that those who use the roads should pay for them.
- A tax increase is veiled by the overall price of fuel.
- Delaware's current rate of $\$ 0.23$ per gallon is in line with surrounding states. New Jersey is $\$ 0.145$ per gallon; Maryland is $\$ 0.235$ per gallon; and Pennsylvania is $\$ 0.262$ per gallon.
- Fuel taxes are regressive; the burden is heavier on low-income users.
- Currently not indexed annually. Indexing of motor fuel tax would provide additional revenues on an on-going basis.
- Increasing fuel-efficient vehicles decreases this revenue source.
- Tie rate to inflation factor and timeframes.


## 4. Eliminate Document Fee Trade Discount

Revenue Raised: $\$ 13.6$ million
Issues to consider:

- It would be less regressive than other options.
- It could negatively impact sales.

5. Increase Motor Vehicle Document Fees by $\mathbf{. 2 5 \%}$

Revenue Raised: \$6.1 million
Issues to consider:

- Delaware's current fee of $2.75 \%$ is low compared to surrounding states and is the third lowest in the U.S. Maryland's fee is $5.0 \%$, and Pennsylvania's and New Jersey's are $6.0 \%$.
- It is less regressive than other options.
- It could negatively impact sales.


## 6. Increase Motor Vehicle Registration Fees by $\mathbf{\$ 1}$

Revenue Raised: $\$ 1.1$ million
Issues to consider:

- Delaware's current fee of $\$ 20$ per year is low compared to surrounding states and is fourth lowest in the country. Pennsylvania's fee is $\$ 36$ per year; Maryland's fee is $\$ 40$ per year and New Jersey's fee is $\$ 81$ per year.
- Delaware's fee was last increased in 1965. If this revenue source had been indexed for inflation at that time, the current fee would be $\$ 125$.
- The fees are regressive, though at a very low amount.
- The fees are an inelastic revenue source; the revenue over time does not grow as rapidly as the costs of transportation programs.

7. Increase DART Fees $\mathbf{5 . 0 \%}$

Revenue Raised: $\$ 0.8$ million
Issues to consider:

- The benefits principle says that those who use the services should pay for them.
- The fees are regressive.
- It would discourage public transportation ridership.


## 8. Increase Drivers' License Fees by $\mathbf{\$ 1 . 0 0}$

Revenue Raised: $\$ 2.1$ million
Issues to consider:

- Delaware's current fee of $\$ 2.50$ is low compared to surrounding states. New Jersey's fee is $\$ 6.00$. Maryland's and Pennsylvania's fee are $\$ 6.50$.
- The benefits principle says that those who use the services should pay for them.
- The fees are regressive.
- It is an inelastic revenue source.


## B. Sources of New Revenues/Policy Options

1. Developer Fees/ Impact Fees $\mathbf{-} \mathbf{\$ 1 , 0 0 0}$ per new home permit

Revenue Raised: $\$ 6.0$ million
Issues to consider:

- The benefits principle says that those who create the need for new transportation infrastructure should support some of the associated cost.
- Easy mobility to surrounding states may mean no relief from transportation pressures.
- Housing construction is an important part of the State's economy.


## 2. Revoke County Share of the Realty Transfer Tax for New Development that Occurs Outside Livable Delaware Perimeters

Revenue Raised: $\$ 7.0$ million

Issues to consider:

- Counties are approving development that raises transportation costs. Counties should contribute revenue to help fund these costs.
- Stress would be placed on County budgets.
- Could be administered to promote Livable Delaware

3. Utility Fees $\mathbf{- 0 . 2 5 \%}$

Revenue Raised: $\$ 2.0$ million
Issues to consider:

- This seeks to recover costs of additional right of way needed for utilities.
- The benefits principle says that those who create the need for new transportation cost should support some of the associated cost.
- It would be a new tax requiring legislative action.
- If DelDOT charged a fee for the use of right of way, it is likely the utility companies would expect DelDOT to bear utility line relocation costs as an additional project cost.

4. Tire Tax - $\$ 1$ per tire

Revenue Raised: $\$ 1.0$ million

Issues to consider:

- The benefits principle says that those who create the need for new transportation infrastructure should support some of the associated cost.
- It would be a regressive tax.
- Tire retailers would be resistant.
- It would be a new tax requiring legislative action.


## 5. Eliminate Community Transportation Fund (CTF) \& Municipal Street Aid

Revenue Raised: $\$ 25.0$ million
Issues to consider:

- CTF projects should compete for project dollars with all other transportation projects.
- Legislator's address transportation needs through this program.
- These programs are considered as part of the DelDOT Core Business.


## 6. Reauthorize Existing Projects

Issues to consider:

- It would involve realigning the Capital Transportation Program with actual revenue sources.
- Impact to the prioritization process established by the Metropolitan Planning Organizations in each county.


## 7. Deauthorize Existing Projects

Issues to consider:

- An alignment of the Capital Transportation Program with actual revenue sources
- Impact to the prioritization process established by the Metropolitan Planning Organizations in each county.
- Review of investments made to existing projects.


## 8. Delay Existing Projects

Issues to consider:

- Must align project progression with revenue sources available.
- Project phases and timelines would be reestablished for each project.
- Impacts the existing prioritization process established between the Metropolitan Planning Organizations and the department.
- Prolongs the completion of projects resulting in increased cost.


## C. Increase Borrowing

Issues to consider:

- It would increase amount dollars available to finance capital projects.
- Relaxing $50 \%$ pay-go percentage will also provide additional leverage to the TTF.
- Increased borrowing could lead to downgrade by rating agency community.
- Debt coverage ratios and pay-go percentage are the two most important protections assigned by ratings community and investors.
- Apply $50 / 50$ on a rolling ten year basis (4 years back and 6 years forward)


## D. Transfer of DeIDOT Operations to the General Fund

Issues to consider:

- It would undo shifts in operational costs to the TTF since inception.
- It decreases the amount of revenue available to the General Fund for other initiatives absent a corresponding increase in General Fund taxes and or fees.
- A sustainable General Fund revenue source will have to be identified.


## E. Other Alternative Revenue Options

## 1. Concession

Issues to consider:

- It would provide substantial upfront money for unfunded projects.
- DelDOT would be in an advantageous position to bid on maintenance and operation contracts.
- An economically more efficient toll pricing for SR 1 would be likely.
- There is concern that providing an initial lump sum of cash could lead to diversion of sale proceeds to non-transportation uses.
- Public perception that the State no longer controls a State asset.


## 2. Cost Share

Issues to consider:

- Department develops baseline for standard improvements/upgrades for roadway improvements.
- Municipality would be responsible for upgrades/improvements outside of the standards.
- May be cost prohibitive for municipalities


## 3. Public/Private Partnership

Issues to consider:

- Adds private incentive to participate in project design and construction.
- May cost the public more for a capital project because it would be completed more quickly.
- Creates partnership between private sector and public agencies.
- Return on investment for a private, for-profit agency.
- Anticipates a design/build approach in which the private agency leverages resources for completing a capital project quicker.


## VII. Financial Management Measures

## A. Internal Measures

The Department Finance Unit ensures that the resources of the Transportation Trust Fund are managed in accordance with all federal and state guidelines. Currently, financial management is coordinated through three separate electronic financial systems. The DelDOT BACIS system is antiquated and in need of replacement. The DTC Peoplesoft application is in need of upgrades and continuous maintenance. Additionally, the State's DFMS system is in need of replacement to allow for a more comprehensive accrual-based accounting system. As a result of these issues, as well as the need to manage resources in an efficient and comprehensive manner, the Department has implemented the following initiatives:

1. ERP Peoplesoft Financials: DelDOT is a partner in the development and implementation of this comprehensive accounting system. The implementation of this system will eliminate the current dual systems (BACIS and DFMS) and will allow for one comprehensive tool for managing both projects and expenditures.
2. Capital Project Expenditure Checkbooks: These checkbooks have been established internally as a mechanism for tracking all expenditures, by project and phase, in a consolidated manner. Each project manager now can access a project checkbook via the DelDOT intranet. The information is updated daily to allow for real time expenditure reporting. The checkbook system was implemented in 2005. The continued development and growth of the application will blend directly into the ERP Peoplesoft financial application.
3. Operating Budget Expenditure Reporting: Due to the department operating on a distinct accounting system tracking of expenditures is difficult for agencies outside of DelDOT. Beginning with the FY06 budget, DelDOT now provides a monthly expenditure report, by budget code and line item, to OMB staff. This initiative provides for improved communication and information between DelDOT and the Office of Management and Budget.
4. Monthly Expenditure Review and Reconciliation: Due to the fact that the Department manages more than one accounting system, it is necessary to ensure that all transactions reconcile to each system. The Finance unit has implemented a monthly reconciliation process which recognizes errors and/or deficiencies within a 30-day time period. This process allows for the processing of payments to be monitored more closely.

## B. External Measures

The Task Force recommends a number of external fiscal management measures be implemented to monitor projected revenues versus projected spending.

These recommendations include:

1. Regular Review of Expenditure Estimates: This would consist of a formal review by an independent body, such as the Delaware Economic and Financial Advisory Council, using best practices, that provides an alert when expenditure estimates are outpacing available revenues.
a. Provide the State's bond issuing officers and the members of the Joint Bond Bill with a 12 to 18 -month spending forecast including the size and timing of any planned borrowing transactions.
2. Program Limits - Making the Estimate Meaningful: Part of this review would create a limit on Capital projects programming that considers the level of funding available for capital improvements and the potential timing for implementing the projects contained in the Capital Program.
3. Six-Year Capital Transportation Program (CTP) - Revenues versus Spending: This review should evaluate the multi-year revenue forecast with the multi-year spending forecast, i.e. Master Spending Summary versus Capital Program. Subsequent to the completion of the project authorization process outlined on page 5 of this report, the department will develop for presentation to and adoption by the Council on Transportation. A part of the CTP adoption process is a six year financial plan which will include projected revenues, other income, federal support, debt issuance, operating expenses, debt service payments and capital spending. Capital spending projections will be directly tied to both authorized but unexpended capital authorization and new capital authorization being requested in the CTP. The six year operating and capital expenditure projections will be matched against current and projected revenues to discern the financial feasibility and affordability of the CTP. On or before January $1^{\text {st }}$ of each year, the Secretary of Transportation will review the Trust Fund Financial Plan with the Secretary of Finance, Director of OMB and members of the Bond Bill Committee to determine the extent to which: (a) the CTP should be reduced; (b) additional revenues are to be secured at certain times and levels across the six years to meet the $50 / 50$ pay go and 2.25 coverage tests; or (c) a combination of the first two items.

## Appendix A Executive Order 69

## Executive Order Number Sixty-Nine Establishing A Task Force To Recommend Options For Providing Additional Funding To, And Accelerating The Construction Of, Needed Improvements Overseen By The Delaware Department Of Transportation

WHEREAS, the Delaware Department of Transportation ("DelDOT") has identified significant shortfalls of funding for the Transportation Trust Fund ("TTF") occasioned by, among other things: i) increasing demands on the State's transportation system due to unprecedented traffic growth; ii) limited resources for the design and construction of necessary projects to improve safety and provide needed mobility; iii) substantial increases in the costs of land acquisition, labor, and raw materials required to construct and maintain a wide variety of transportation improvements; and iv) cost increasing project delays caused by layers of state and federal regulations; and

WHEREAS, predictable and sustainable funding for critical transportation projects in the State is vital to maintaining the quality of life for the State's citizens, promoting responsible development without undue damage to environmental, historic, and cultural resources, and ensuring the State's economic competitiveness and vitality; and

WHEREAS, in the absence of the development of increased resources for the TTF, the State will be unable to provide on a timely basis the key projects identified in DelDOT's long-range transportation plan, including but not limited to: i) accelerated completion of safety and capacity improvements along, and connecting to, the state's limited access highways (Routes 1, I-95, I295, I-495); ii) provision of alternate service roads and the purchase of development moderating easements along the state's major arterial network (e.g., Routes 1, 13, and 113); iii) revitalization of older residential, commercial and industrial neighborhoods, especially those adjacent to the waterways and rail lines which were the transportation precursors to the existing highway network; and iv) improvements to the quality, variety, and frequency of alternative transportation services by bus, rail, vanpool, rideshare and other methods; and

WHEREAS, it is essential for DelDOT to maintain its current excellent credit rating by not subjecting the TTF to increased leverage through excessive borrowings; and

WHEREAS, the state has previously adopted legislation permitting DelDOT to enter into a variety of public-private partnerships to design and/or build transportation facilities in the state; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has established both legislative authority and a pool of funds available for competitive application by states pursuing innovative financing and construction techniques, and has made these programs a high priority for the U.S. DOT program for federal reauthorization; and

WHEREAS, DelDOT has identified and analyzed several potential options for increasing both short- and long-term resources to the TTF for the purposes of meeting the demands of DelDOT's long-range plan, including changes to the toll structures on two limited access highways, changes in the allocation of monies from the State's General Fund, and construction in whole, or in part, of needed improvements to I-95, SR1, and U.S. Route 301 by private sector owners/lessees; and

WHEREAS, it is appropriate and in the best interests of the State that the resource needs of DelDOT and options to undertake key transportation development initiatives be thoroughly explored, examined and evaluated, and it is appropriate that these options be studied by a small group of knowledgeable individuals capable of making comprehensive recommendations in time to permit the Governor and the General Assembly to evaluate and, if desirable, include them into DelDOT's financial plan for FY 2007 and beyond;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, RUTH ANN MINNER, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE, DO HEREBY ORDER AND DECLARE AS FOLLOWS:

1. A Transportation Development and Funding Options Task Force ("Task Force") is established. The Task Force shall consist of fifteen (15) members, as follows:
a. The Secretary of the Department of Transportation, who shall serve as Chairman of the Task Force, or his designee;
b. The State Budget Director, or her designee;
c. The Secretary of Finance, or his designee;
d. The State Treasurer, or his designee;
e. The Co-Chairs of the Joint Task Force on Capital Improvements;
f. One member selected by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate;
g. One member selected by the Minority Leader of the Senate;
h. One member selected by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;
i. One member selected by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives;
j. One member of the Governor's staff, appointed by the Governor;
k. A registered professional engineer, appointed by the Governor;
2. A representative of the Delaware Contractors' Association, appointed by the Governor; and
m . Two (2) additional members of the public (who shall not be employed by the State, or conduct any business with the State involving the TTF), appointed by the Governor.
3. The Task Force shall examine proposals for increasing both short- and longterm resources for the TTF for Fiscal Year 2007 and future years, so as to assure the continued timely planning, development and construction of the critical projects identified in DelDOT's long-range transportation plan. Without limitation of the foregoing, the Task Force is authorized and directed to consider whether and to what extent the State should pursue: i) changes in toll structures for any of the State's toll roads; ii) the construction and/or operation of any public highway or bridge under DelDOT's control by private entities, subject to the necessary oversight of the state; and/or iii) the creation of new, or adjustments to existing, taxes and fees that are directed to the TTF.
4. Staff from, or qualified consultants to, DelDOT, the Department of Finance and/or the State Budget Office shall provide support to the Task Force, as needed.
5. The Task Force shall meet on a regular basis, with its first meeting to occur not later than June 30, 2005.
6. The Task Force shall issue a report of its recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly not later than November 30, 2005.

APPROVED: June 1, 2005

Governor's Transportation Development and Funding Options Task Force Report
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# Appendix C Analysis of General Fund Revenues vs. <br> TTF Resources <br> (FY 1996-2005) 

# General Funds vs. TTF Resources <br> (FY 1996-2005) 

## I. Absolute Amounts

|  | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Fund | $\$ 1,656.2$ | $\$ 1,779.2$ | $\$ 2,046.2$ | $\$ 2,190.7$ | $\$ 2,279.0$ | $\$ 2,329.0$ | $\$ 2,425.7$ | $\$ 2,436.4$ | $\$ 2,735.5$ | $\$ 2,877.6$ |
| TTF | $\$ 371.7$ | $\$ 373.8$ | $\$ 421.6$ | $\$ 414.8$ | $\$ 446.0$ | $\$ 463.9$ | $\$ 455.4$ | $\$ 437.0$ | $\$ 494.1$ | $\$ 486.6$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 0 2 7 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 1 5 3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 4 6 7 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 6 0 5 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 7 2 5 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 7 9 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 8 8 1 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 8 7 3 . 4}$ | $\$ 3, \mathbf{2 2 9 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 3 6 4 . 2}$ |

## II. Relative Distribution

| General Fund | $81.7 \%$ | $82.6 \%$ | $82.9 \%$ | $84.1 \%$ | $83.6 \%$ | $83.4 \%$ | $84.2 \%$ | $84.8 \%$ | $84.7 \%$ | $85.5 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| TTF | $18.3 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ | $17.1 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | $16.4 \%$ | $16.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ | $15.3 \%$ | $14.5 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

## III. Growth Rates

A. Year Over Year

| General Fund | $3.4 \%$ | $7.4 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $12.3 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| TTF | $9.2 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $12.8 \%$ | $-1.6 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $-1.8 \%$ | $-4.0 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ | $-1.5 \%$ |

B. Period to Period
(FY 1996-2000)

| General Fund | $37.6 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| TTF | $20.0 \%$ |

(FY 2001-2005)

| General Fund | $23.6 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| TTF | $4.9 \%$ |

(FY 1996-2005)
General Fund $\quad 73.7 \%$
TTF 30.9\%

The General Fund has grown over $73 \%$ compared to the Trust Fund Growth at a low of 29\%
The General Fund makes up $86 \%$ of the total budget in 2005 compared to the Trust Fund at $14 \%$ of the total budget.

# Appendix D <br> Analysis of DelDOT Operating, DTC Subsidy and Debt Service Expenses <br> (FY 1996-2005) 

DelDOT Operating, DTC Subsidy and Debt Service Expenses (FY 1996-2005)
$\left.\begin{array}{llrlrlllllll} & \text { Fiscal Year } & \mathbf{1 9 9 6} & \mathbf{1 9 9 7} & \mathbf{1 9 9 8} & \mathbf{1 9 9 9} & \mathbf{2 0 0 0} & \mathbf{2 0 0 1} & \mathbf{2 0 0 2} & \mathbf{2 0 0 3} & \mathbf{2 0 0 4} & \mathbf{2 0 0 5}\end{array} \begin{array}{r}\mathbf{9 6 - 0 5} \\ \text { AVG }\end{array}\right]$

## Appendix E Core Business Detail

## Core Business:

DelDOT's responsibility to focus on the demands of the transportation infrastructure requires the need for a commitment to core business operations. In an effort to maintain existing roadways, provide for the management of new and upgraded roadways as well as ensure that the department is equipped with the necessary inventory to meet the needs of the state, the Task Force has identified core business functions. These functions must be managed and appropriately funded in order to continue the basic operations of the department. Core business initiatives include:

Paving and Rehabilitation Program Provides for the paving of the state's $12,500+$ line miles of pavement. This program represents approximately $34 \%$ of the roadway infrastructure statewide. Roads in the paving program are on a 10-year rehabilitation cycle.

Heavy Equipment Program

Technology

Allows for the replacement and refurbishment of equipment on a $7-15$ year life cycle. Equipment includes six-wheel trucks, mowers, street sweepers, earth movers, snowplows, brush clippers, and other machinery.

Supports the department's entire technological infrastructure. Initiatives include, Statewide Peoplesoft financial system implementation and necessary upgrades, Geographical Information System (GIS) efforts, department-wide equipment management, software and hardware upgrades, Division of Motor Vehicle initiatives statewide, as well as other projects and programs.

Community Transportation Program Provides members of the General Assembly with funding for projects within electoral boundaries.

Municipal Street Aid Program

Materials \& Minor Contracts

Supports the maintenance and rehabilitation of transportation infrastructure within municipal boundaries.

Provides for the maintenance of drainage projects, sign structures, and entrance pipes, as well as repairs to guardrails, sink holes, and sign and high mast lighting structures. The program also includes the inspection and mitigation of drainage problems.
Bridge Management
Transit Vehicle Replacement
$\underline{\text { and Expansion }}$

Planning

Transportation Enhancement

Transit Facilities

Transportation Facilities

Provides for a five-year inspection cycle for over 200 bridges statewide. This includes lighting and structure inspections, pavement marking maintenance and movable bridge maintenance.

Allows for the response to population demands and for fixed route bus services. Current fixed and Paratransit buses are on a 5-10 year replacement schedule.

Allows statewide long-range transportation plan, coordinate county comprehensive development plans, and PLUS activities, manages programs focused on bicycle and pedestrian improvements statewide.

Works within the surface transportation program on integration of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, preservation of historic transportation structures, and beautification of transportation related projects.

Maintains and expands train stations, park and ride locations and transit hubs throughout the state.

Allows for regular maintenance and inspection of existing transportation facilities and support of new facilities.

## Core Business Needs Detail FY2006 - FY2011

## Delaware Department of Transportation <br> Finance Sub-Committee



# Appendix F Federal Authorization (SAFE TEA-LU) Earmarked Projects \& Funding 

# Earmarked Projects \& Funding 

Federal Authorization (SAFE TEA-LU)

## Capital Program

5-Sep
Federal Match/Formula
Grants \& Allocations
Transit Systems
Support Systems
Road System
State Match Needs
Updated based on Revised SAFETEA-LU
Federal Highway Authorization per SAFETEA-LU
Federal Transit Authorization per SAFETEA-LU

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 2,550$ | $\$ 3,125$ | $\$ 3,125$ | $\$ 3,125$ | $\$ 3,125$ |
| $\$ 3,550$ | $\$ 3,625$ | $\$ 4,125$ | $\$ 4,375$ | $\$ 4,625$ | $\$ 4,875$ |
| $\$ 41,470$ | $\$ 36,747$ | $\$ 37,328$ | $\$ 37,708$ | $\$ 38,899$ | $\$ 40,136$ |
| $\$ 47,020$ | $\$ 42,922$ | $\$ 44,578$ | $\$ 45,208$ | $\$ 46,649$ | $\$ 48,136$ |
| $\$ 47,020$ | $\$ 35,197$ | $\$ 36,556$ | $\$ 37,071$ | $\$ 38,253$ | $\$ 39,472$ |
| $\$ 151,100$ | $\$ 159,300$ | $\$ 164,900$ | $\$ 166,600$ | $\$ 171,598$ | $\$ 176,746$ |
| $\$ 11,912$ | $\$ 12,388$ | $\$ 13,414$ | $\$ 14,233$ | $\$ 15,000$ | $\$ 15,800$ |


| Earmark Match Needs | Received |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Indian River | \$46,200 | \$6,750 | \$2,160 | \$2,160 |  |  | \$9,240.00 |
| I-95, Turnpike and SR 1 Improvements | \$24,400 |  | \$1,356 | \$1,356 |  |  | \$4,880.00 |
| Fixed Route Transit Buses | \$3,000 |  | \$375 | \$375 |  |  | \$600.00 |
| Commuter Rail, NE Corridor, Wilmington to Newark | \$5,000 |  | \$2,500 | \$2,500 |  |  | \$1,000.00 |
| DelTrac | \$3,000 |  | \$375 | \$375 |  |  | \$600.00 |
| I-95 Riverfront Interchange | \$20,000 |  | \$2,500 | \$2,500 |  |  | \$4,000.00 |
| Wilmington Train Station | \$6,500 |  | \$813 | \$813 |  |  | \$1,300.00 |
| Rail Crossings | \$1,500 |  | \$375 |  |  |  | \$600.00 |
| U of D Bike trails | \$1,000 |  |  |  |  |  | \$400.00 |
| Wyoming Mill Road | \$1,500 |  | \$375 |  |  |  | \$600.00 |
| Dover - System Preservation | \$1,000 |  | \$250 |  |  |  | \$400.00 |
| Del State - Hydrogen Storage | \$2,000 |  |  |  |  |  | \$800.00 |
| Bombay Hook Roads | \$5,000 |  | \$1,250 | \$1,250 |  |  | \$1,000.00 |
| Lake Gerar Bridge | \$1,600 |  | \$400 |  |  |  | \$640.00 |
| Woodland Ferry | \$2,500 |  | \$625 |  |  |  | \$1,000.00 |
| State Funding for Advanced Federal (SFAF) |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$27,060.00 |
| Indian River | \$5,000 | \$1,250 | \$240 | \$240 |  |  | \$1,000.00 |
| Commuter Rail - Middletown to Newark | \$4,000 |  | \$500 | \$500 |  |  | \$800.00 |
| Pomeroy Bike Trail | \$4,771 |  | \$1,193 |  |  |  | \$2,146.95 |
| U of D - Fuel Cell Program | \$4,979 |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,240.55 |
| Harrington Truck Route | \$8,500 |  | \$2,125 | \$2,125 |  |  | \$1,700.00 |
| Rehoboth Avenue | \$6,750 |  | \$1,688 | \$1,688 |  |  | \$1,350.00 |
| Destination Station | \$1,000 |  | \$250 |  |  |  | \$450.00 |
| State Funding for Advanced Federal |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$9,687.50 |
| Fixed Route Transit Buses | \$8,000 |  | \$1,000 | \$1,000 |  |  | \$2,250.00 |
| State Funding for Advanced Federal |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,250.00 |
| U of D - Fuel Cell Program | \$1,103 |  |  |  |  |  | \$581.50 |
| State Funding for Advanced Federal |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$581.54 |
| Subtotal for Advanced Federal |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$39,579.00 |
| State Match Needs |  | \$8,000 | \$20,348 | \$16,881 | \$0 | \$0 | \$45,229 |
| Total State Funding for Advanced Federal (SFAF) |  |  | \$9,859.04 | \$29,720.00 |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| State Match Needs | $\$ 55,020$ | $\$ 73,129$ | $\$ 91,179$ | $\$ 45,208$ | $\$ 46,649$ | $\$ 48,136$ | $\$ 359,321$ |
| New State Match based on SAFETEA-LU Updates | $\$ 55,020$ | $\$ 65,403$ | $\$ 83,157$ | $\$ 37,071$ | $\$ 38,253$ | $\$ 39,472$ | $\$ 318,376$ |

## Outstanding State Authorizations

Prior Years Subtotal
\$680,227,093
Plus FY 2006 Authorizations
\$393,100,000
Less FY 2006 Spending
(\$266,000,000)
Outstanding Authorization as of 06/30/06
\$807,327,093

## Appendix G Master Spending Summary

# Master Spending Assumption Summary October 2005 

| Master Spending Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2007-2012 } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ |
| Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Total Revenues Available | \$475,787 | \$425,937 | \$425,026 | \$432,346 | \$437,993 | \$445,182 | \$454,538 | \$2,621,022 |
| Beginning Balance | 66,683 | 73,960 | 50,004 | 50,040 | 50,032 | 50,046 | 50,016 | 324,098 |
| Ending Balance | 73,960 | 50,004 | 50,040 | 50,032 | 50,046 | 50,016 | 50,056 | 300,195 |
| Adjusted Total Project Revenues | 468,510 | 449,893 | 424,990 | 432,354 | 437,980 | 445,212 | 454,497 | 2,644,926 |
| Less |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Operating and Debt Service | 352,510 | 327,988 | 351,164 | 368,538 | 379,503 | 391,842 | 416,067 | 2,235,102 |
| Equals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Total State Revenues Available for Capital | 123,277 | 97,949 | 73,862 | 63,808 | 58,490 | 53,340 | 38,471 | 385,920 |
| Plus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Borrowing | 150,000 | 74,000 | 73,900 | 63,800 | 58,500 | 53,300 | 38,500 | 362,000 |
| Equals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. State Resources Available - Capital | 266,000 | 195,905 | 147,726 | 127,616 | 116,977 | 106,670 | 76,930 | 771,824 |
| Capital Program Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. State Capital Spend - Core Business Needs | 82,800 | 116,866 | 120,372 | 123,983 | 127,703 | 131,534 | 135,480 | 755,938 |
| 7. Required to Match Federal Funds | 55,000 | 65,403 | 83,157 | 37,071 | 38,253 | 39,472 | 41,000 | 304,356 |
| 8. Funds Remaining | 128,200 | 13,636 | $(55,803)$ | $(33,438)$ | $(48,979)$ | $(64,336)$ | $(99,550)$ | (288,470) |
| 9. Non Federal (100\% State) Capital Program | 128,200 | 13,636 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13,636 |
| Federal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Federal Authorization-Anticipated | 235,100 | 140,784 | 146,217 | 148,283 | 153,010 | 157,888 | 159,900 | 906,082 |
| 11. Total Capital Program - Current Funding | 501,100 | 336,689 | 293,943 | 275,899 | 269,987 | 264,558 | 236,830 | 1,677,906 |
| 12. Maximum Deliverable Program (@ 10\% inflation) | 500,000 | 550,000 | 605,000 | 665,500 | 732,050 | 805,255 | 885,781 | 4,243,586 |
| 13. Emergency/Contingency Projects (@ 10\% inflation) |  | 20,000 | 22,000 | 24,200 | 26,620 | 29,282 | 32,210 | 154,312 |
| 14. Total Capital Program - Demonstrated Need |  | 570,000 | 627,000 | 689,700 | 758,670 | 834,537 | 917,991 | 4,397,898 |
| 15. Funding Gap |  | (\$233,311) | (\$333,057) | (\$413,801) | (\$488,683) | (\$569,979) | (\$681,161) | 52,719,992 |

## Assumptions for Master Spending Summary

- Beginning cash balance of $\$ 50 \mathrm{M}$ - each fiscal year
- $50 \%$ pay go maintained each fiscal year
- No reimbursement from Port of Wilmington
- Federal Funds based on 2005 Reauthorization
- Borrowing based on traditional coverage factors
- Annual Operating Costs increased at $7 \%$
- Project costs increase annually by $10 \%$
- Capital program $\$ 500$ million in FY2006, increased annually by $10 \%$
- $\$ 20$ million is provided in $\mathrm{FY}^{\prime} 07$, and increased by $10 \%$ per year, for emergency/contingency projects
- Interest rate assumption at 7\% annually and Debt Service Reserve Fund and Issuance Cost estimated at $7.8 \%$ annual


# Appendix H FY07-FY12 Project List 

|  |  |  | \& $\otimes$ | - | OOO |  | O | O-8 | $\bigcirc$ | (1) | 8 | O | (os | - |  | 8  <br> 0  <br> 0  <br> 0  <br> 0 0 <br> 0  | ¢ | A | - | 8 | O-8080 | ( | ¢ | - |  | A |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 는 } \\ & \frac{1}{4} \\ & \text { N N } \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $0$ |  | $\theta$ |  |  | O <br> 8 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 |  |  | (200 |  |  | Ois | $\dot{\theta}$ | $\underset{A}{\circ}$ | - |  | $0$ | b |  | $0$ |  |  | $0$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 8 \\ \hline 8 \\ \frac{1}{9} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline 0 \mathrm{O} \\ \hline 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8 \\ & \text { is } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline 8 \\ \hline-8 \\ \hline-\infty \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | 8 | On |  | - |  | O 0 0 0 0 | (\%) |  |  |  |  | O8 |  |  | OO |  |  |
|  | $0$ | $0$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | O | + |  |  | 为O | $\underset{A}{\circ}$ | ¢ |  | O |  |  | O |  |  | O |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 을 } \\ & \underset{i}{4} \end{aligned}$ |  | O |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | 앙 |  |  | O |  |  |  | BO | $\underset{A}{\circ}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | O |  |  | O |  |  | O |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $0$ |  | $\stackrel{O}{6}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  |  | O |  |  |  | (1) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ |  | O2O-8 |  |  | O20 |  |  | N |  | O |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \infty \\ \underset{\sim}{\text { ®N}} \end{gathered}$ |  | $0$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | \% |  |  | - | - |  | O- | (108 |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 0 \\ \hline 8 \\ \infty \\ \infty \\ \infty \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | O20 |  |  | O-3 |  |  | Nos |  | - |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{N}} \\ \underset{i}{ } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | (os) |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \hline 0 \\ \hline 0 \\ \hline-\infty \end{array}\right\|$ |  | 擖 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | (1) | $\dot{\theta}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ |  | O20 |  |  | O-3 |  | - | Nos |  | - | \% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ®i } \\ & \underset{i}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \infty \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{O} \\ & \mathrm{O} \\ & \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ |  | 8080 |  | $$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | O |  |  | - | - 8 |  | O | - | O |  |
|  |  | $\bigcirc$ | 1 |  | - ¢ | 30 |  | - |  | 0 | Q |  | 0 |  | 2 ${ }_{2}^{3}$ |  | ¢ | 30 | Q |  |  |  | 30 | 0 | Q ¢ | 0 | 은 |
|  | Glenville Wetland Mitigation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | to l-295 Program <br>  <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | [ |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{o} \\ & \stackrel{\mathrm{p}}{\mathrm{i}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { 읃 }}{\stackrel{\circ}{5}}$ |  |  | - | - |  | K | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  | - |  | \| |  |
| 은 | EXPRE |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{4}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | ¢ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - NORTH
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - NORTH

| PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - NORTH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { FED } \\ & \text { FUNDS } \end{aligned}$ | Contract Number | Project Title | PHASE | FY 2006 | FY 2007 | FY 2008 | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL FY } \\ & \text { 2006-2011 } \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL FY <br> 2012-2025 | TOTAL PROJECT COST |
| YES | 23-500-38 | US 301 Truck Weigh Station and Inspection Facility |  | \$3,100 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,600 | \$0 | \$3,600 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | R/W |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | C | \$3,100 | 500 |  |  |  |  | \$3,600 |  | \$3,600 |
| YES | 24-011-02 | SR 2, South Union Street From Railroad Bridge to Sycamore Street, Wllmington |  | \$0 | \$500 | \$1,000 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,500 | \$0 | \$5,500 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | PE |  | \$500 |  |  |  |  | \$500 |  | \$500 |
|  |  |  | R/W |  |  | \$1,000 |  |  |  | \$1,000 |  | \$1,000 |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  | \$4,000 |  |  | \$4,000 |  | \$4,000 |
|  |  | SR48 Retaining Wall |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$50 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | R/W |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | C |  |  | \$50 |  |  |  | \$50 |  | \$50 |
| YES | TBD | $\begin{array}{l}\text { SR299, Middletown Odessa Road, N442, Silver Lane Rd } \\ \text { to SR1 }\end{array}$ |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$20,000 | \$21,000 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  | \$1,000 |  |  | \$1,000 |  | \$1,000 |
|  |  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | R/W |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 |
| YES | 23-044-02 | SR141, I-95 to Burnside Blvd |  | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$1,000 | \$3,100 | \$20,000 | \$23,100 |
|  |  |  | PD |  | \$100 |  |  |  |  | \$100 |  | \$100 |
|  |  |  | PE |  |  |  |  | \$2,000 | \$1,000 | \$3,000 |  | \$3,000 |
|  |  |  | R/W |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 |
| YES | 23-044-02 | SR141, US13 to l-95 (includes Bridge over US13) |  | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$3,100 | \$20,000 | \$23,100 |
|  |  |  | PD |  | \$100 |  |  |  |  | \$100 |  | \$100 |
|  |  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  | \$3,000 | \$3,000 |  | \$3,000 |
|  |  |  | R/W |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 |
| YES | 24-044-01 | SR2 - Elkton Road, MD Line to Delaware Avenue |  | \$500 | \$2,000 | \$3,000 | \$17,000 | \$17,000 | \$10,000 | \$49,500 | \$0 | \$49,500 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | PE | \$500 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 |  | \$6,500 |  | \$6,500 |
|  |  |  | R/W |  |  | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 |  | \$3,000 |  | \$3,000 |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  | \$15,000 | \$15,000 | \$10,000 | \$40,000 |  | \$40,000 |
| YES | 24-106-04 | SR 141, SR2, Kirkwood Highway to Faulkland Road (includes Bridge 1-600) |  | \$550 | \$5,600 | \$8,400 | \$4,200 | \$0 | \$0 | \$18,750 | \$0 | \$18,750 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | PE | \$100 |  |  |  |  |  | \$100 |  | \$100 |
|  |  |  | R/W | \$450 |  |  |  |  |  | \$450 |  | \$450 |
|  |  |  | C |  | \$5,600 | \$8,400 | \$4,200 |  |  | \$18,200 |  | \$18,200 |
| YES | 25-106-01 | SR 141, SR 2 Kirkwood Hwy to SR 34 Faulkland Road, Advanced Utility Relocations |  | \$1,850 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,850 | \$0 | \$2,850 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
|  |  |  | R/W | \$600 |  |  |  |  |  | \$600 |  | \$600 |
|  |  |  | C | \$1,250 | \$1,000 |  |  |  |  | \$2,250 |  | \$2,250 |



PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - NORTH

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - NORTH


PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - NORTH

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - NORTH

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - NORTH
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PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - SOUTH

| \$ | 1,468.00 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| \$ | 341.00 |
| \$ | 27.00 |
| \$ | 1,100.00 |
| \$ | 3,500.00 |
| \$ | 300.00 |
| \$ | 500.00 |
| \$ | 2,500.00 |
| \$ | 3,200.00 |
| \$ |  |
| \$ | 200.00 |
| \$ | 1,000.00 |
| \$ | 2,000.00 |
| \$ | 510.00 |
| \$ |  |
| \$ | 50.00 |
| \$ | 10.00 |
| \$ | 450.00 |
| \$ | 35,100.00 |
| \$ |  |
| \$ | 4,000.00 |
| \$ | 7,600.00 |
| \$ | 23,500.00 |
| \$ | 22,435.00 |
| \$ |  |
| \$ | 1,435.00 |
| S | 7,000.00 |
| \$ | 14,000.00 |
| \$ | 11,973.00 |
| \$ |  |
| \$ | 573.00 |
| \$ | 1,900.00 |
| \$ | 9,500.00 |
| \$ | 50 |

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - SOUTH
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PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - SOUTH

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - SOUTH


PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - SOUTH

| Fed Funds | Contract Number | Project Title | Phase | FY 06 |  | FY 07 |  | FY 08 |  | FY 09 |  | FY 10 |  | FY 11 |  | FY 06-11 |  | FY 12-25 |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | XX-XXX-XX | SR 24 Intersection Improvements S277, Angola Road \& SR 30 |  | \$0 |  | \$500 |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |  | \$500 |  | \$0 |  | \$500 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | PE |  |  | \$500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$500 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | R/W |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Collector Roads |  |  |  | \$ 1,657.00 | \$ | 30,555.00 | \$ | 33,731.00 | \$ | 38,806.70 | \$ | 30,154.00 | \$ | 18,000.00 | \$ | 152,903.70 | \$ | - | \$ | 152,903.70 |
| LOCAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 21-045-01 \text { ESTP- } \\ & 2001(28) \end{aligned}$ | Harrington Truck Route |  | \$ 122.00 | \$ | 3,700.00 | \$ | 4,000.00 | \$ | 750.00 | \$ | 450.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 9,022.00 |  |  | \$ | 9,022.00 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  | PE | \$ 122.00 | \$ | 100.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 222.00 |  |  | \$ | 222.00 |
|  |  |  | RW |  | \$ | 1,600.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,600.00 |  |  | \$ | 1,600.00 |
|  |  |  | C |  | \$ | 2,000.00 | \$ | 4,000.00 | \$ | 750.00 | \$ | 450.00 |  |  | \$ | 7,200.00 |  |  | \$ | 7,200.00 |
|  | 24-036-01 | Ocean Drive Drainage |  | \$ 89.25 | \$ | 470.00 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 559.25 |  |  | \$ | 559.25 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  | PE | \$ 89.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 89.25 |  |  | \$ | 89.25 |
|  |  |  | RW | \$ - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  | C |  | \$ | 470.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 470.00 |  |  | \$ | 470.00 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23-042-01 ESTP- } \\ & \text { K023(3) } \end{aligned}$ | Loockerman St/Forest St |  | \$ | \$ | 600.00 | \$ | 100.00 | \$ | 3,500.00 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 4,200.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 4,200.00 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | PE |  | \$ | 600.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 600.00 |  |  | \$ | 600.00 |
|  |  |  | RW |  |  |  | \$ | 100.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 100.00 |  |  | \$ | 100.00 |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 3,500.00 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 3,500.00 |  |  | \$ | 3,500.00 |
|  | 21-032-03 N/A | DuPont Manor Drainage |  | \$ | \$ | - | \$ | 922.50 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 922.50 | \$ | - | \$ | 922.50 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  | RW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  | \$ | 922.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 922.50 |  |  | \$ | 922.50 |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 24-200-19 \text { ETEA- } \\ 2004(20) \end{array}$ | St. Jones River Greenway Isaac Branch Segment, Phase II |  | \$ 410.00 | \$ | 447.50 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 857.50 | \$ | - | \$ | 857.50 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  | RW | \$ 10.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 10.00 |  |  | \$ | 10.00 |
|  |  |  | C | \$ 400.00 | \$ | 447.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 847.50 |  |  | \$ | 847.50 |
|  | To be initiated FY Of | SR 24, Love Creek to SR 1 |  | \$ | \$ | 7,625.00 | \$ | 8,600.00 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 16,225.00 | \$ | - | \$ | 16,225.00 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  | PE |  | \$ | 625.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 625.00 |  |  | \$ | 625.00 |
|  |  |  | RW |  | \$ | 2,000.00 | \$ | 3,600.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 5,600.00 |  |  | \$ | 5,600.00 |
|  |  |  | C |  | \$ | 5,000.00 | \$ | 5,000.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 10,000.00 |  |  | \$ | 10,000.00 |
|  | XX-XXX-XX | Plantation Road |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |  | \$640 |  | \$1,780 |  | \$4,980 |  | \$4,000 |  | \$11,400 |  | \$0 |  | \$11,400 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | PE |  |  |  |  | \$640 |  | \$500 |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,140 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | R/W |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,280 |  | \$1,000 |  |  |  | \$2,280 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$3,980 |  | \$4,000 |  | \$7,980 |  |  |  |  |
|  | XX-XXX-XX | Lewes Boat Launch Ramp <br> (DNREC lead, significant PD invol) |  | \$0 |  | \$4,400 |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |  | \$4,400 |  | \$0 |  | \$4,400 |
|  |  |  | PD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | R/W |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  | \$4,400 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$4,400 |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Local |  |  |  | \$ 621.25 | \$ | 17,242.50 | \$ | 14,262.50 | \$ | 6,030.00 | \$ | 5,430.00 | \$ | 4,000.00 | \$ | 47,586.25 | \$ | - | \$ | 47,586.25 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | \$ 18,816.05 | \$ | 176,746.50 | \$ | 199,881.86 | \$ | 187,995.51 | \$ | 178,934.00 | \$ | 156,750.00 | \$ | 919,123.92 | \$ | 1,221,200.00 | \$ | 140,323.92 |



| Rail Safety Program (Improvements) | \$750,000.00 |  | Est. Budget; New program assigned to Traffic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Red Light Photo Enforcement | n/a | High | Funding to come from Red Light Program. |
| Safety Comp. Plan Implementation | \$75,000.00 | High | Training, implementation, public awareness campaigns. |
| Work Zone Final Rule Implementation | \$25,000.00 | High | Training, implementation \& public awareness campaigns |
| Construction of FY 05 HSIP Sites | \$750,000.00 | High | Construction of HSIP sites; Funding included in HSIP line. |
|  |  |  |  |
| Sub Total | \$3,200,000.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total for FY 07 Traffic Program | \$21,093,006.00 |  |  |

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - BRIDGES

| Contract Number | Project Title | Phase |  | FY 06 |  | FY 07 |  | FY 08 |  | FY 09 |  | FY 10 |  | FY 11 |  | FY 06-11 |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22-075-02 | Br. 2-10A on SR 6 over Duck Creek, Woodland Beach |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | \$ - | \$ | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  | RW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ - |  |  | \$ |  |
|  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | \% - |  |  | \$ |  |
|  | Indian River Inlet Bridge |  | \$ | - |  | 36,500.0 | \$ | 36,500.0 | \$ | 37,000.0 | \$ | 37,000.0 |  | \$ 37,000.0 |  | 184,000.0 | \$ | . | \$ | 184,000.0 |
|  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  | RW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ - |  |  | \$ |  |
|  |  | C |  |  |  | 36,500.0 | \$ | 36,500.0 |  | 37,000.0 |  | 37,000.0 |  | \$ 37,000.0 |  | 184,000.0 |  |  | \$ | 184,000.0 |
| 22-074-01 | Br. 1-160 on Maryland Avenue over Little Mill Creek |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | \$ - | \$ | - - | \$ |  | \$ | - |
|  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ |  |
|  |  | R/W |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ |  |
|  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |
| 24-073-03 | Br. 3-328 on S454 over Figgs Ditch |  | \$ | 285.0 | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | \$ - | \$ | S 285.0 | \$ | - | \$ | 285.0 |
|  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  | RW | \$ | 25.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 25.0 |  |  | \$ | 25.0 |
|  |  | C | \$ | 260.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 260.0 |  |  | \$ | 260.0 |
| 25-071-05 | Br. 1-100 on N243, Old Kennett Road, West of Centerville |  | \$ | 25.0 | \$ | 100.0 | \$ | 681.0 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | \$ |  | \$ 806.0 | \$ |  | \$ | 806.0 |
|  |  | PE | \$ | 25.0 | \$ | 50.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 75.0 |  |  | \$ | 75.0 |
|  |  | RW |  |  | \$ | 50.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 50.0 |  |  | \$ | 50.0 |
|  |  | C |  |  |  |  | \$ | 681.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 681.0 |  |  | \$ | 681.0 |
| 24-073-04 | Br. 3-376 on S376 over Sandy Branch, Selbyville |  | \$ | 130.0 | \$ | 585.0 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | \$ |  | \$ 715.0 | \$ |  | \$ | 715.0 |
|  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  | RW | \$ | 130.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 130.0 |  |  | \$ | 130.0 |
|  |  | C |  |  | \$ | 585.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 585.0 |  |  | \$ | 585.0 |
| 23-071-04 | Br. 1-201 on Beech Hill Drive over Pike Creek |  | \$ | 19.0 |  | 1,322.0 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | \$ |  | \$ 1,341.0 | \$ |  | \$ | 1,341.0 |
|  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | \$ |  |
|  |  | RW | \$ | 19.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 19.0 |  |  | \$ | 19.0 |
|  |  | C |  |  |  | 1,322.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | + 1,322.0 |  |  | \$ | 1,322.0 |
| 25-071-06 | Br. 1-361 on SR 72 over Muddy Run |  | \$ | - | \$ | 566.0 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | \$ |  | \$ 566.0 | \$ |  | \$ | 566.0 |
|  |  | PE | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  | RW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  | C |  |  | \$ | 566.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 566.0 |  |  | \$ | 566.0 |
| 25-071-01 | Br. 1-503 on St. Annes Church Road over Norfolk Southern |  | \$ | - | \$ | 330.0 | \$ | 5,060.0 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | \$ |  | \$ 5,390.0 | \$ |  | \$ | 5,390.0 |
|  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  | RW |  |  | \$ | 330.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ 330.0 |  |  | \$ | 330.0 |
|  |  | C |  |  |  |  | \$ | 5,060.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,060.0 |  |  | \$ | 5,060.0 |
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| Contract Number | Project Title | Phase | FY 06 |  | FY 07 |  | FY 08 |  | FY 09 |  | FY 10 |  | FY 11 |  | FY 06-11 |  | FY 12-25 |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Br 2-124D on K124 over Grecos Canal |  | \$ | 30.0 | \$ | 15.0 | \$ | 520.0 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 565.0 | \$ |  | \$ | 565.0 |
|  |  | PE | \$ | 30.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 30.0 |  |  | \$ | 30.0 |
|  |  | RW |  |  | \$ | 15.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 15.0 |  |  | \$ | 15.0 |
|  |  | C |  |  |  |  | \$ | 520.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 520.0 |  |  | \$ | 520.0 |
| 22-074-14 | Br 1-137, Wooddale Covered Bridge over Red Clay Creek |  | \$ | 30.0 | \$ | 1,190.0 | \$ | 1,000.0 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 2,220.0 | \$ |  | \$ | 2,220.0 |
|  |  | PE | \$ | 30.0 | \$ | 50.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 80.0 |  |  | \$ | 80.0 |
|  |  | RW |  |  | \$ | 140.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 140.0 |  |  | \$ | 140.0 |
|  |  | C |  |  | \$ | 1,000.0 | \$ | 1,000.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 2,000.0 |  |  | \$ | 2,000.0 |
| 25-074-01 | Br. 1-118, Ashland Covered Bridge over Red Clay Creek |  | \$ | - | \$ | 386.0 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 386.0 | \$ |  | \$ | 386.0 |
|  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | S |  |
|  |  | RW |  |  | \$ | 50.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 50.0 |  |  | s | 50.0 |
|  |  | C |  |  | \$ | 336.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 336.0 |  |  | \$ | 336.0 |
| 25-073-01 | Br. 3-362 on S465 at Chipman's Pond |  | \$ | - | \$ | 1,021.0 | \$ | 1,000.0 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 2,021.0 | \$ |  | \$ | 2,021.0 |
|  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ |  |
|  |  | RW |  |  | \$ | 50.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 50.0 |  |  | \$ | 50.0 |
|  |  | C |  |  | \$ | 971.0 | \$ | 1,000.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,971.0 |  |  |  | 1,971.0 |
| 25-071-02 | Br. 1-465 on N424, Old Corbitt Road, East of Odessa |  | \$ | - | \$ | 67.0 | \$ | 733.0 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 800.0 | \$ |  | \$ | 800.0 |
|  |  | PE |  |  | \$ | 47.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 47.0 |  |  | \$ | 47.0 |
|  |  | RW |  |  | \$ | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 20.0 |  |  | \$ | 20.0 |
|  |  | C |  |  |  |  | \$ | 733.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 733.0 |  |  | \$ | 733.0 |
| 24-074-05 | Br. 1-660 \& 1-664 on US 13, SW of New Castle |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 531.0 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 531.0 | \$ |  | \$ | 531.0 |
|  |  | PE |  |  |  |  | \$ | 66.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 66.0 |  |  | \$ | 66.0 |
|  |  | RW |  |  |  |  | \$ | 45.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 45.0 |  |  | \$ | 45.0 |
|  |  | C |  |  |  |  | \$ | 420.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 420.0 |  |  | \$ | 420.0 |
| 23-071-03 | Br. 1-141 on SR 48 over Chestnut Run |  | \$ | - | \$ | 182.0 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 182.0 | \$ |  | \$ | 182.0 |
|  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  | RW |  |  | \$ | 32.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 32.0 |  |  | \$ | 32.0 |
|  |  | C |  |  | \$ | 150.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 150.0 |  |  | \$ | 150.0 |
|  | Br 3-707 on SR1-A over Silver Lake |  | \$ | - |  | 478.0 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 478.0 | \$ | - | \$ | 478.0 |
|  |  | PE |  |  | \$ | 58.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 58.0 |  |  | \$ | 58.0 |
|  |  | RW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ |  |  |  | \$ | , |
|  |  | C |  |  |  | 420.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 420.0 |  |  | \$ | 420.0 |

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - BRIDGES

| Contract Number | Project Title | Phase | FY 06 | FY 07 | FY 08 | FY 09 | FY 10 | FY 11 | FY 06-11 | FY 12-25 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23-071-02 | Brs 1-394N \&S on US13 over Drawyers Creek |  | \$ | \$ | \$ 3,550.0 | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ 3,550.0 | \$ | \$ 3,550.0 |
|  |  | PE |  |  | \$ 50.0 |  |  |  | \$ 50.0 |  | 50.0 |
|  |  | RW |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ |  | \$ |
|  |  | C |  |  | \$ 3,500.0 |  |  |  | \$ 3,500.0 |  | \$ 3,500.0 |
| 25-076-02 | Br. 3-237 on Old Furnace Road over the Nanticoke River |  | \$ | \$ - | \$ 2,435.0 | \$ | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 2,435.0 | \$ | \$ 2,435.0 |
|  |  | PE |  |  | \$ 280.0 |  |  |  | \$ 280.0 |  | \$ 280.0 |
|  |  | RW |  |  | \$ 55.0 |  |  |  | \$ 55.0 |  | \$ 55.0 |
|  |  | C |  |  | \$ 2,100.0 |  |  |  | \$ 2,100.0 |  | 2,100.0 |
|  | Br. 3-508S on US113 over Betts Pond |  | \$ | \$ | \$ 220.0 | \$ | \$ | \$ - | \$ 220.0 | \$ - | 220.0 |
|  |  | PE |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ |  | \$ |
|  |  | RW |  |  | \$ 20.0 |  |  |  | \$ 20.0 |  | \$ 20.0 |
|  |  | C |  |  | \$ 200.0 |  |  |  | \$ 200.0 |  | \$ 200.0 |
| Total |  |  | \$ 12,875.0 | \$ 56,694.0 | \$ 58,145.0 | \$ 59,000.0 | \$ 60,000.0 | \$ 61,000.0 | \$ 307,714.0 | \$ 441,000.0 | \$ 748,714.0 |

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - RAIL



## Appendix I Revenue Options Table

## Potential Options

The following tables note the potential options considered by the Task Force to address the TTF issues.
The following revenue options are to be used as examples only. Options may require further review of unit cost and and/or flexible revenue structures

| OPTIONS | ANNUAL REVENUE (millions) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Traditional Sources |  |
| 1. I-95 Toll Options: Raise all axle classes \$1.00 (Oct. 1, 2005) | \$29.5 |
| 2. SR 1 Toll Options <br> a. Raise toll on all cars to $\$ 1.00$ | \$25.0 |
| b. Raise Toll on all Commercial Vehicles \$1.60 per axle | \$7.5 |
| c. Eliminate Car E-Z Pass Discount (Implemented on Delaware Turnpike (I-95) in October 2005) | \$2.0 |
| d. Eliminate Commercial E-Z Pass Discount | \$2.0 |
| e. Tie toll schedule to price inflator | \$0.6-\$2.0 |
| 3. Increase Motor Fuel Tax 5 cents (both Gas \& Diesel) | \$25.0 |
| 4. Eliminate Document Fee Trade Discount | \$13.6 |
| 5. Increase Motor Vehicle Document Fees by .25\% | \$6.1 |
| 6. Increase Motor Vehicle Registration Fees | $\$ 11.0$ (for each $\$ 10$ increase) |
| 7. Increase DART Fees 5\% | \$.8 |
| 8. Increase Drivers License Fees by $\$ 1.00$ | \$2.1 |
| New Sources |  |
| 1. Developer Fees / Impact Fees | \$6.0 |
| 3. Revoke County Share of Realty Transfer Tax for New Development that Occurs Outside Livable DE Perimeters | \$7.0 |
| 4. Utility Fees - . $25 \%$ | \$2.0 |
| 5. Tire Tax: $\$ 1.00$ per tire | \$1.0 |
| 6. Eliminate Community Transportation Fund (CTF) \& Municipal Street Aid | \$26.1 |
| 7. Long-Term Concession Lease | \$1.0-\$4.0 billion |

