

State Initiatives to Support Transportation Funding: Synthesis

**Prepared for
Jeff Doyle**

**Director, Public-Private Partnerships Division
Washington State Department of Transportation**

**Prepared by
Kathy Lindquist, WSDOT Research Office
Michel Wendt, WSDOT Library**

March 2012

Transportation Synthesis Reports (TSRs) are brief summaries of currently available information on topics of interest to WSDOT staff. Online and print sources may include newspaper and periodical articles, NCHRP and other TRB programs, AASHTO, the research and practices of other state DOTs and related academic and industry research. Internet hyperlinks in the TSRs are active at the time of publication, but host server changes can make them obsolete.

Request for Synthesis

Jeff Doyle, Director, Public-Private Partnerships Division requested information related to State reports, findings, laws, and recommendations related to transportation funding since 2008.

Databases Searched

- TRID - A Transportation Research Database at the Transportation Research Board (TRB)
- Research in Progress (RiP) – A Database of Current Transportation Research at TRB
- Previous Synthesis Reports on WSDOT Research Website
- Google
- Wisconsin DOT Transportation Synthesis Reports
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) website
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) website
- International Transportation and other Research Websites

Contents

	Page
Transportation Funding Studies by State Since 2008	2
Other Current Transportation Financing Information	13
State Legislation in 2010 and 2011	20

Transportation Funding Studies by State Since 2008

California

Transportation California: The Challenge Ahead

Transportation California Website; 2009

Transportation California has been working to lay the groundwork for a major push to move forward with a new revenue source that will end hand-to-mouth funding and put the construction industry to work building the transportation system of the future.

- Industry leaders have met with Governor Schwarzenegger, top Constitutional officers and both candidates for Governor.
- More than 30 meetings held with legislative leaders and other key lawmakers.
- Presentations made to dozens of industry and business groups.
- Our key labor partners briefed and enlisted in the effort.
- The automobile clubs have been engaged in productive discussions.
- A constructive dialogue established with the environmental community to create a formidable coalition.
- Do extensive opinion and substantive research to identify key messages and concepts that resonate in the Capitol and with voters.
- Legislative approaches developed to make sure that any new revenues will be guaranteed for hard-core transportation purposes and not sidetracked or diverted/

<http://tc.affiniscap.com/displaycommon.cfm?an=1&subarticlenbr=265>

Colorado

Transportation Issues: FASTER created out of Blue Ribbon Transportation Finance and Implementation Panel Recommendations

John Hickenlooper, Governor of Colorado; 2010

Colorado recently passed the FASTER legislation—a bill that received statewide support and created by the Blue Ribbon Transportation Finance and Implementation Panel representing all parts of the State. Many of Colorado's immediate transportation needs such as the repairs and replacements of structurally deficient bridges and roads are now being addressed. FASTER also initiated new transit-funding initiatives, provided the framework for innovative financing of strategic corridor projects such as I-70, and is bringing much needed economic support to the construction industry through the creation of jobs. FASTER was the result of statewide bipartisanship and we will encourage similar approaches and solutions to meet our many other transportation challenges. We understand that Colorado's transportation policies must be comprehensive in order to respond to future growth. We support the State Legislature's creation of a transit division within CDOT to facilitate and monitor rail and bus transportation modes.

<http://www.hickenlooperforcolorado.com/issues?id=0014>

Delaware

Report on Conditions, Planning and Revenue Options for Support of the Transportation Trust Fund

Transportation Trust Fund Task Force; 2011

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

- Transferring DelDOT operating costs from the TTF back to the General Fund, over an extended period of time;
- Transit fees and greater general fund support for paratransit;
- 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 users of the public infrastructure or Department services;
- Increasing the TTF borrowing, thereby requiring less new revenues;
- Decreasing the TTF borrowing, thereby requiring more new revenues;
- 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

[http://www.deldot.gov/information/community_programs_and_services/ttf_task_force/pdf/Final Transportation Trust Fund Task Force Report 033111.pdf](http://www.deldot.gov/information/community_programs_and_services/ttf_task_force/pdf/Final_Transportation_Trust_Fund_Task_Force_Report_033111.pdf)

Idaho

Governor's Task Force on Modernizing Transportation Funding in Idaho - Final Report

Governor's Task Force on Modernizing Transportation Funding; 2011

The task force voted to submit six recommendations to the Governor for consideration as follows:

- Options studied and ranked by the task force should be forwarded for consideration by the Governor and Legislature. The options were ranked in eight categories including revenue predictability, fairness and cost and ease of implementation (see Revenue Options Matrix in the Appendix).
- Revenue enhancements should be aligned to improve cost equity among various vehicle classes.
- Local jurisdictions should be allowed to increase public transportation revenue using the options outlined in the public-transportation portion of the Revenue Options Matrix.
- The germane committees should examine implementation of new methods to allocate funds to local jurisdictions in a manner that incentivizes efficiency and ensures the funds are used efficiently.
- The Legislature should accept the recommendation of the Legislative Alternative Funding Task Force to continue the 3% distribution from the state fuel tax to the Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation.
- The Legislative Alternative Funding Task Force should address a funding shift from the Idaho State Police to the State Highway Account, which causes the need for a new funding source for ISP.

http://itd.idaho.gov/taskforce/Task_Force_Final_Report_Low_Res.pdf

Kansas

Kansas T-WORKS Program

New Program Outline, Including Funding Scenarios
Kansas DOT; 2010

This document was presented at the Special Interim Committee on Transportation on January 4, 2010. It contains a description of what a new program would accomplish and most importantly, two funding scenarios. The scenarios were both recommended out of the committee for consideration by the 2010 legislature.

http://ktoc.net/group_file.aspx?FileID=ac55aa4d394842afa6e362466f87377c

Transportation-Leveraging Investments in Kansas (-LINK for short)

Kansas Department of Transportation; Preliminary Recommendations; January 2009

New Approaches to Transportation

T-Link Guiding Principles:

- Preserve the existing transportation system. This is T-LINK's overriding principle. Kansans have spent billions of dollars on their highway system and fully funding preservation of that system is the top priority.
- Support the economic priorities of Kansas. While previous investments in transportation have provided significant benefits, more attention must be paid to the interaction between transportation investments, jobs retention, and growth of the Kansas economy.
- Implement new transportation business models.
- The state could leverage the benefits of investment in transportation infrastructure regardless of funding levels by implementing new business models. The business model recommendations were developed with the understanding that requests for greater flexibility or additional funding should be met with increased accountability. While T-LINK supports these new business models at a conceptual level, KDOT will need to work closely with stakeholders across the state to flesh out the details.
- Increase funding for all modes of transportation. T-LINK identified increasing needs across all modes and recommends targeted funding increases when revenues allow. The following chart shows recommended funding levels.
- Fund a new transportation program with a broad range of funding sources.

In the long-term, meeting the state's growing transportation needs will require more funding. T-LINK urges consideration of a multi-pronged strategy that includes increased funding from existing sources and using new funding sources.

<http://www.kansastlink.com/downloads/TLINK%20Preliminary%20Recommendations.pdf>

Maine

Transportation Funding and Finance Options

In: *Connecting Maine: Maine's Long Range Transportation Plan*, Maine.gov; 2010

Inadequate resources prohibit MaineDOT from succeeding in achieving the goals of Connecting Maine. MaineDOT recognizes that completing the transportation improvements and necessary system preservation to support economic development and quality of life will require more funding than is projected under current funding sources. Traditionally, MaineDOT has utilized a Resource Allocation Policy that focuses on four guiding principles:

- Meet system preservation needs
- Invest in needs for all modes
- Invest in transportation system management and travel demand management alternatives
- Target limited resources for any new highway and non-highway capacity to the highest priorities

While this approach has helped MaineDOT maintain its current assets in relatively good condition, this policy does not adequately address or support Maine's social and economic needs into the future. In light of rising costs, increasing demands, and static or declining revenues, the options for distributing funds using the resource allocation policy will continue to be limited primarily to the funding of preservation activities. In short, the likelihood is that without addressing dramatic funding source changes, no additional transportation system capacity or new initiatives will be forthcoming.

<http://www.maine.gov/mdot/connectingmaine/documents/pdf/Chapter5.pdf>

Maryland

Select Recently Enacted State Transportation Funding Initiatives

Prepared for the Maryland Blue Ribbon Commission on Transportation Funding; January 24, 2011

Document includes two tables:

- Select Recently Enacted State Transportation Funding Initiatives
- Recent Failed Attempts at 'Unique' Transportation Funding Initiatives

[http://www.mdot.maryland.gov/Planning/Blue_Ribbon/Documents/Meeting_Agenda_012411/State by State Summary of Revenue Initiatives Final.pdf](http://www.mdot.maryland.gov/Planning/Blue_Ribbon/Documents/Meeting_Agenda_012411/State_by_State_Summary_of_Revenue_Initiatives_Final.pdf)

Value Capture: A Transportation Revenue Option for Maryland

Prepared for Maryland Blue Ribbon Commission on Transportation Funding; Maryland DOT; 2010

Governor O'Malley responded to an invitation from the National Governors Association to submit an application to participate in a Policy Academy on Shaping a New Approach to Transportation and Land Use Planning, sponsored by the NGA Center for Best Practices. Maryland proposed to explore the use of value capture to fund transportation investments and was selected as one of five states to participate in the program, all researching different topics. Executive representatives from the Maryland State Governor's office and the Departments of Business and Economic Development, Transportation, and Planning have been working together to better understand the potential benefits and feasibility of expanding the use of value capture in Maryland. This summary prepared for the Maryland Blue Ribbon Commission on Transportation Funding provides the highlights of their ongoing efforts.

http://www.mdot.maryland.gov/Planning/Blue_Ribbon/Documents/Meeting_Agenda_032111/NG_A_Value_Capture_Summary_for_BRC_032111.pdf

Massachusetts

A Framework for Creating a Financially Stable Public Transportation System for Massachusetts

By Rafael Mares and Stephanie Pollack, the Conservation Law Foundation (CLF) and the Kitty & Michael Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy at Northeastern University (Dukakis Center); 2010

Lessons from the Blue-Ribbon Summit on Financing the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) and Regional Transit Authorities (RTAs)

On November 1, 2010, the Conservation Law Foundation (CLF) and the Kitty & Michael Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy at Northeastern University (Dukakis Center), with the generous support of the Barr Foundation, convened a Blue-Ribbon Summit on Financing the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) and Regional Transit Authorities (RTAs). While the Commonwealth faces serious challenges funding and financing all modes of transportation, the Summit focused solely on financing public transportation because of transit's critical role throughout Massachusetts.

The transit services provided by the MBTA and RTAs in the majority of the Commonwealth's communities give access to housing, employment, education, health care, and other critical services to everyone, regardless of whether they own or can drive a car. Maintaining and expanding the Commonwealth's transit system is an essential strategy for growing the state's economy, connecting residents to jobs, and achieving important environmental and sustainability goals, including the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. In order to achieve transit's potential, however, adequate funding needs to be put in place to support and improve existing services, maintain transit vehicles and assets, and expand service frequency and availability to better serve both current and potential transit users statewide. The purpose of the Summit was to inform the development of a long-term, politically viable policy and advocacy strategy to sustain a financially stable, world-class public transportation system throughout Massachusetts. The fifteen members of the Blue-Ribbon Expert Panel represented a carefully selected group of national and Massachusetts experts on transit and transportation finance.¹ In addition, four experts from Massachusetts-based organizations with extensive knowledge of local transit and transportation finance issues served as resource people to provide additional data, history, and perspective.² This Framework is based on the discussions that took place at the Summit, research for background and options papers undertaken prior to the Summit, and discussions that took place before, during and after the Summit with those experts, resource people and participant observers from key Massachusetts stakeholder organizations. While it is based on information, input, and insights from all of these participants and stakeholders, this document solely represents the conclusions of CLF and the Dukakis Center.

http://www.northeastern.edu/dukakiscenter/focus_areas/transportation/blueribbonsummit/documents/BlueRibbon_Summit_Framework_final.pdf

Michigan

Transportation Solutions - a Report on Michigan's Transportation Needs and Funding Alternatives

The Michigan Transportation Funding Task Force; 2008

The purpose of the Task Force, as defined by P.A. 221, is to “review the adequacy of surface transportation and aeronautics service provision and finance” in Michigan, review strategies for maximizing return on transportation investment, and evaluate the potential of alternative strategies to replace or supplement transportation taxes and fees. A major and consistent focus of the group has been the need to stimulate economic activity and enhance personal mobility. As they began their work seven months ago, the members of the Task Force very quickly realized the enormity and importance of the task that had been appointed to them.

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdot/MDOT_TF2_Entire_Report_255609_7.pdf

Minnesota

Report of Minnesota's Mileage-Based User Fee Policy Task Force

Prepared by the Humphrey School of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota; December 2011

The Mileage-Based User Fee (MBUF) Policy Task Force (“Task Force”), appointed by Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) Commissioner Tom Sorel, was formed to identify and evaluate issues related to potential future implementation of an MBUF system in Minnesota.¹ Under a potential MBUF system, drivers would be charged based on the number of miles they drive, regardless of the type of energy source used to propel the vehicle, and instead of being charged by the gallon for fuel consumed in operating a vehicle. Over a period of six months, the Task Force discussed and evaluated the overall MBUF concept and related issues, determined benefits and concerns, considered potential system design options and preferences and formulated policy objectives, Findings and Recommendations.

The Task Force was comprised of 25 Minnesotans representing a broad range of experience in the transportation industry, from public and private sector standpoints, the economic development community, and a privacy expert. A list of Task Force members is included at the end of this Report. While many Task Force members serve key stakeholder groups, they were to represent both the interests of their particular constituency and the entire state in the analysis of a potential MBUF system.

The University of Minnesota's Humphrey School of Public Affairs and MnDOT staff facilitated the process and provided technical advice to the Task Force. The Task Force was provided market research derived from focus groups and the results of a large sample public survey of Minnesotans on MBUF. The Task Force reviewed information from technical experts on the subject, and held a series of six meetings discussing the various MBUF system related issues.

This Report is the outcome of the Task Force's deliberations and work over a six-month period, from June through November 2011. The Report is divided into two parts:

- Part 1 briefly summarizes what the Task Force learned during its discovery/investigative phase.²
- Part 2 describes the Findings and Recommendations of the Task Force to the Commissioner.

1 In a separate but related initiative, MnDOT is conducting a demonstration project wherein 500 people from Hennepin and Wright Counties are testing technology that could potentially be used to collect MBUF in the future. Aggregated participant feedback will be supplied to the MnDOT Commissioner and other state policymakers upon completion of the project.

2 A detailed technical report regarding the work performed and reviewed will be issued subsequent to the release of this Report.

<http://www.dot.state.mn.us/mileagebaseduserfee/pdf/mbufpolicytaskforcereport.pdf>

About the Mileage-Based User Fee (MBUF) Policy Task Force Report

MNDOT Website; 2011

The goal of the Mileage-Based User Fee (MBUF) Policy Study was “To engage stakeholders and a Policy Task Force, with the intent of identifying and evaluating issues for potential implementation of MBUF in Minnesota.” The Mileage-Based User Fee (MBUF) Policy Task Force was asked to stay true to this goal, and not expand its scope to other transportation finance issues.

Task Force members are listed in the back page of this report. This report was prepared by the Humphrey School of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota in December, 2011. The report represents the views of the Mileage-Based User Fee Policy Task Force and does not necessarily represent the views or policies of the Minnesota Department of Transportation or the University of Minnesota. The Humphrey School of the University of Minnesota is hospitable to a diversity of opinions and aspirations. The Humphrey School itself does not take positions on issues of public policy. The MnDOT Project Management Team consisted of Cory Johnson (Project Manager), Ken Buckeye, Christine Krueger, and Ray Starr. The Consultant Team consisted of Lee Munnich (Principal Investigator), John Doan (Project Manager), Ferrol Robinson, Joe Loveland, David Ungemah, John Chambers and Matt Schmit.

<http://www.dot.state.mn.us/mileagebaseduserfee>

Value Capture for Transportation Finance

Center for Transportation Research, University of MN; 2011

Researchers identify eight potential strategies to raise funding for transportation.

A team of University of Minnesota transportation and public policy researchers has identified eight potential strategies to raise funding for transportation infrastructure investments. When a large public facility is built—such as a new freeway interchange or transit station—the value of surrounding private property can go up, sometimes substantially. The eight strategies capture a part of this value. The following documents describe the strategies, their policy implications, and the legal considerations needed to use several of them in Minnesota. One of the reports is for the Minnesota State Legislature.

<http://www.cts.umn.edu/Research/Featured/ValueCapture/index.html>

Symposium on Transportation Long-Range Funding Solutions – Proceedings

Center for Transportation Studies, University of Minnesota; 2009

During the 2008 legislative session, the Minnesota legislature directed MN/DOT to evaluate the long-range needs of state highways, bridges, and transit and investigate potential strategies to meet these needs. The symposium focused on three sections of the legislation:

- Identification of options for maintenance and improvement of the state’s transportation system, with specific reference to the effects of the potential

- The analysis of alternative pricing options used in other states and countries and their potential for use, public acceptance, alleviation of congestion, and revenue generation in this state.
- Identification of road use pricing and other alternative pricing mechanisms, with particular consideration of key environmental impacts such as air quality, water quality, and greenhouse gas emissions, and estimates of implementation costs, user costs, and revenue.

http://www.dot.state.mn.us/planning/program/pdf/fundingsymposium_proceedings09_wb.pdf

Oregon

Oregon Transportation Vision Committee Report

Report to Governor Ted Kulongoski; November 2008

Introduction

Oregon's multi-billion dollar transportation infrastructure has not been maintained to keep up with population and freight traffic growth, hindering Oregon's ability to move people, goods, and commerce effectively throughout the state. If we do not make critical improvements . . . forecasted . . . congestion on our roads will increase by 42 percent by 2025, creating gridlock for commuters and further challenging Oregon's ability to compete in the traded sector economy. In addition, since transportation accounts for nearly 40 percent of greenhouse gas emissions, we must reexamine how we provide transportation options that complement our carbon reduction strategies.

In December 2007, Oregon Governor Ted Kulongoski, citing risks to the economy, environment, and quality of life for all Oregonians, identified transportation as one of his top priorities for the 2009 Oregon Legislative session.

Governor Kulongoski convened three workgroups composed of business leaders, legislators, local and state officials, transportation stakeholders and sustainability and land use experts to develop recommendations for a comprehensive transportation package for the 2009 legislative session to meet immediate needs and create a framework for future action. The workgroups focused on three areas:

Governance; Public Awareness; and Vision

Governance

The Governance Committee, chaired by Steve Clark of Community

Newspapers, was charged with developing recommendations for improving efficiency, coordination and accountability in the transportation system, including how transportation decisions are made, the balance between local, state and federal jurisdictions in decision-making, and how projects are prioritized.

Public Awareness

The Public Awareness Committee, chaired by Chip Terhune, Chief of Staff to the Governor, was charged with developing a plan to engage the public in discussions about the importance of transportation to Oregon's economy and quality of life. The committee was asked to develop tools to help inform the public about the needs of the transportation system, its benefits, and how transportation dollars are spent at the local, state, and federal levels. The Governor asked

both of these committees to report to a third, the Transportation Vision Committee, chaired by Patrick Reiten of Pacific Corp.

Vision

The Transportation Vision Committee began its work by developing a consensus statement about what Oregon's transportation system should look like in 2030. It is intended that this vision will help guide transportation investments in 2009. The Governor outlined five core principles to use as guides in developing the recommendations: economic development; local decision-making; sustainability; transparency and oversight; and statewide distribution.

Economic development

Because of Oregon's desirable strong traded sector economy, one in every five jobs in Oregon is transportation related. Transportation is vital to maintain and grow the traded sector economy; without transportation, industry will go elsewhere. Transportation funding stimulates the state's economy and directly creates jobs as the infrastructure is both maintained and expanded. Oregon's experience over the past half decade is that these jobs are from Oregon companies, and those companies have grown as a result.

Local decision-making and identification of priorities

The Oregon Transportation Commission will work with Area Commissions on Transportation, local governing bodies, and stakeholders to identify priorities for transportation investment.

Sustainability

The state must develop an investment strategy that not only preserves the current system but makes a strategic investment in a sustainable transportation system, including working towards requirements of the state's goals on greenhouse gas reduction.*

Transparency and oversight

Funding strategies, based on adopted policies, will involve an open discussion for citizen input and direction to guarantee that the funding priorities deliver what the citizens want.

Statewide distribution

Transportation funding is a priority for every corner of the state, whether it is maintenance, preservation, or expansion of the system. All Oregonians must benefit from this investment.
<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/docs/HB2186page/Vision.pdf?ga=t>

Pennsylvania

Report of the Transportation Advisory Commission

Pennsylvania Department of Transportation; 2011

Introduction: Pennsylvania's transportation facilities have served as a key component of economic strength for many generations. Today, much like the rest of our nation, Pennsylvania transportation infrastructure is aging significantly due to decades of underinvestment. Roadways, bridges, transit, rail freight, aviation, ports, and intercity passenger rail have all suffered as a result of insufficient funding, creating significant maintenance backlogs, and reductions in service. Due to increasing vehicle fuel efficiency, Pennsylvania now collects less fuel tax revenue per mile traveled than it has at any time in the past. This has led to a serious

decline in the money available to be spent on improvements to the transportation system, leading to a growing funding gap.

<http://www.tfac.pa.gov/>

Transportation Funding Study – Final Report

Pennsylvania State Transportation Advisory Committee; 2010

With the increasing volatility and uncertainty surrounding Pennsylvania's transportation funding picture, the state TAC decided to examine how transportation is currently financed and evaluate alternatives that realistically account for changing economic conditions. This analysis focused primarily on highways, bridges, and public transportation. The magnitude of recent energy and financial trends has roiled all transportation sectors. Further, inadequate transportation funding—at all levels of government—jeopardizes the necessary maintenance and expansion of our system at the same time that it faces greater demands than ever before. This TAC study quantifies the impact and extent of the problem, and offers findings and recommendations for consideration by PennDOT, the State Transportation Commission, and the state General Assembly in addressing this difficult issue.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.pa.us/public/pdf/TFAC/Transportation%20Funding%20Study%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf>

Rhode Island

Blue Ribbon Panel for Transportation Funding

Rhode Island DOT; 2008

In recognition of an increasingly serious reduction in highway funding and an aging transportation infrastructure in critical need of repair or replacement, Governor Carcieri has established a Blue Ribbon Panel to assess Rhode Island's transportation needs and to identify options for potential funding sources.

<http://www.dot.state.ri.us/blueribbon/index.asp>

Texas

It's About Time: Investing in Transportation to Keep Texas Economically Competitive

Texas 2030 Committee Report; 2011

The March 2011 report from the 2030 Committee, *It's About Time: Investing in Transportation to Keep Texas Economically Competitive*, provides updated details about transportation challenges in Texas and the possible solutions to those challenges. The Texas Transportation Commission adopted this report on March 31, 2011.

. . . In July 2010, Texas Transportation Commission Chair Deirdre Delisi reconvened the 2030 Committee and charged this panel of experienced and respected business leaders with developing an updated analysis of the current state of the Texas transportation system, determining the household costs of under-investing in the system and identifying potential revenue options to fund transportation improvements. . .

<http://texas2030committee.tamu.edu/>

Funding the Future - A Forecast of Transportation Finance

Texas Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Texas Transportation Institute, Center for Transportation Research, & Texas Department of Transportation; 2009

This report is a part of an extensive analytical effort to provide the best possible information for state and local planners and decision makers. It is the product of a project by the Texas Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (TEMPO) and the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) to produce an estimate of expected conventional revenues through 2035, and quantification of possible revenue enhancements. In a separate but complementary project, the Texas Transportation Institute and the Center for Transportation Research, under direction of the 2030 Committee, have developed comprehensive estimates of Texas' road capacity needs and system maintenance needs. Combining the results of the TEMPO revenue forecast and the 2030 needs estimate provides an unprecedented depth of insight into the statewide transportation financing challenge over the next two decades.

ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/gpa/072809_tempo_report.pdf

Virginia

Reinventing Virginia for the 21st Century: McDonnell Transportation Financing Strategy

Bacon's Rebellion Blog, August 25; 2011

The McDonnell administration soon will unleash \$8 billion in new transportation spending on Virginia. But not everyone is convinced that borrowing billions for highway mega-projects is a wise use of the commonwealth's money.

<http://www.baconsrebellion.com/articles/2011/08/mcdonnell.html>

Washington State

Implementing Alternative Transportation Funding Methods: Final Report

By the Cedar River Group et al; for the WA State Legislature; Joint Transportation Committee; January 5, 2010

Executive Summary

The 2009 legislature directed the Joint Transportation Committee (JTC) to conduct a comprehensive analysis of mid-term and long-term transportation funding mechanisms and methods. The study analyzes the feasibility and practicality of implementing funding methodologies identified in the JTC's 2007 Long-Term Transportation Financing Study, as well as other methods identified by the committee, staff, and consultants. The principle objective is to identify specific steps for the legislature and agencies to begin implementing viable mid-term and long-term transportation funding approaches. While the primary focus is on state imposed and collected transportation taxes and fees, the report also includes a discussion of local funding options.

http://www.leg.wa.gov/JTC/Documents/Studies/ImplementingALtFunding_FinalReportJan2010.pdf

Other Current Transportation Financing Information

Transportation Financing Internationally, Nationally, State, and Local

Equity of Evolving Transportation Finance Mechanisms

TRB Special Report 303; TRB; November 2011

TRB Special Report 303: Equity of Evolving Transportation Finance Mechanisms addresses the equity of alternatives to current transportation finance mechanisms, notably mechanisms based on tolling and road use metering (i.e., road pricing). The committee that developed the report concluded that broad generalizations about the fairness of high-occupancy toll lanes, cordon tolls, and other evolving mechanisms oversimplify the reality and are misleading. The fairness of a given type of finance mechanism depends on how it is structured, what transportation alternatives are offered to users, and which aspects of equity are deemed most important.

The committee identified the various dimensions of equity important for public policy debates about evolving finance mechanisms, proposed specific issues for policy makers to consider when evolving mechanisms are proposed and identified areas where future research is needed for a better understanding of the equity implications of such mechanisms.

To move beyond superficial analysis, the report calls on policy makers to insist on well-designed studies of transportation finance that yield reliable information about the likely distribution of burdens and benefits, and that facilitate comparison of a given finance strategy with alternatives. In addition, public policy makers who wish to promote equity should engage their constituents and other stakeholders early and often when considering the use of new or unfamiliar transportation finance mechanisms.

The report calls on researchers to explore further how people modify their use of the transportation system in response to changes in prices and services and the consequences of these responses. It also recommends the development of a handbook for state and local governments describing procedures for conducting equity analyses of transportation finance policies.

http://www.trb.org/Main/Blurbs/165823.aspx?utm_medium=email&utm_source=Transportation%20Research%20Board&utm_campaign=TRB+E-Newsletter+-+11-21-2011&utm_content=Customer&utm_term=

Fall 2011 Fiscal Survey of States

National Associate of State Budget Officers; 2011

This edition of the Fiscal Survey of States demonstrates that although state fiscal conditions continue their slow improvement in fiscal 2012, they are likely to remain constrained due to the lack of a strong national economic recovery and the withdrawal of Recovery Act funds. This slow improvement in state finances highlighted by the 38 states reporting general fund spending growth in 2011 and the 43 states that reported spending growth for 2012. However, 29 states still have lower general fund spending in fiscal 2012 compared to the pre-recession levels of fiscal 2008. Additionally, as states are beginning to experience some improvement in revenue

collections, pressure for state spending in areas such as healthcare and education continue to grow.

<http://nasbo.org/>

Infrastructure 2011: A Strategic Priority

Urban Land Institute and Ernst & Young; Washington, D.C.; 2011

Executive Summary: Based on extensive research and interviews with industry leaders, this report surveys global infrastructure trends and activities in 2011 (part I), then examines in depth current U.S. infrastructure policy and the outlook for meeting the nation's significant repair and rebuilding challenges (part II). The U.S. section forecasts possible progress over the next several years, tracks disparate strategies and major projects in the country's primary metropolitan areas, and recommends approaches for overcoming substantial political and fiscal obstacles.

. . . . The United States notably continues to lag its global competition—laboring without a national infrastructure plan, lacking political consensus, and contending with severe federal, state, and local budget deficits that limit options. Some metropolitan areas appear better positioned when they can forge plans and pool resources for new transit lines and road systems across multiple jurisdictions. States with effective procurement programs and policies are beginning to profit from their ability to engage in public/private partnerships (PPPs). Governors and legislators across the country are beginning to take notice of successful approaches and look to adopt some of the more promising development and finance strategies.

Global Progress

In most of the developed world and in many emerging markets, countries have committed to fulfilling infrastructure agendas as essential for sustaining or enhancing living standards in an increasingly competitive global marketplace. A lot can be learned from what's occurring across the globe, as many countries confront their infrastructure challenges head on:

Despite a severe austerity budget, the U.K. has committed US\$326 billion (£200 billion) over the next five years to continue national infrastructure projects focused on rail, energy production, and broadband access, with an emphasis on reducing the nation's carbon emissions through investments in renewable energy.

European Union countries generally view infrastructure expenditures as dual wins for helping stimulate slowly resuscitating economies and modernizing systems to ensure long-term commercial growth. France, Germany, Spain, and Italy continue to build out high-speed rail and freight networks between major cities and extend cross-border transport links while attempting to lower carbon footprints in line with E.U. objectives. However, many E.U. countries still need more innovation and government support to make PPPs truly viable.

Australia is working to shore up existing infrastructure while setting national priorities for future investments; expansion of ports, refashioning of rail lines, and relief of urban traffic congestion take precedence.

Canada is expanding its PPP initiatives to address the revamping of aging facilities.

Flush with cash from its role as an export-driven manufacturing powerhouse, China is moving ahead with wide-ranging infrastructure programs, including completion of an unprecedented 10,000-mile high-speed rail network by 2020. Newly constructed airports, ports, and subway

systems in China's major centers facilitate the country's growth into the world's second-largest economy and help it deal with mounting congestion from burgeoning urban populations.

India is working hard to attract more private financing for desperately needed infrastructure to nurture aspirations for global economic leadership, while the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait continue to use oil wealth to build out transport hubs and seek energy-efficient solutions for future power and water needs.

Brazil is accelerating road, transit, and water projects to accommodate its burgeoning economy and buttress an enhanced standing on the world stage; it does not want to disappoint people visiting for the 2014 World Cup and the 2016 Summer Olympics.

. . . Despite the nation's unemployment woes, concerns about government spending appetites and potential cost overruns sidetracks the vast job-creation potential of infrastructure projects. Related benefits from reducing carbon footprints—energy efficiencies and greater independence from problematic foreign energy sources—are also failing to gain much traction .

[http://www.uli.org/ResearchAndPublications/PolicyPracticePriorityAreas/Infrastructure/~media/Documents/ResearchAndPublications/Reports/Infrastructure/Infrastructure2011.ashx](http://www.uli.org/ResearchAndPublications/PolicyPracticePriorityAreas/Infrastructure/~/media/Documents/ResearchAndPublications/Reports/Infrastructure/Infrastructure2011.ashx)

Transportation Governance and Finance: A 50-State Review of State Legislatures and Departments of Transportation

The National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Center for Excellence in Project Finance; June 2011

[Executive Summary](#)

[Synthesis](#)

This authoritative analysis of state transportation governance and finance provides an overview of key issues, supplemented by detailed information for all fifty states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. The report focuses on transportation finance and on the roles and relationships between the branches of state government that are most active in transportation issues.

<http://www.ncsl.org/default.aspx?TabId=19117>.

State Transportation Finance Activities & Trends 2011

The Council of State Governments; Capitol Research; Transportation; July 2011

Finance Activities and Trends:

- Traditional revenue sources to fund transportation are in decline, but little was done to shore them up this year.
- While a handful of states made a big splash with major transportation finance legislation this year, budget cuts, delayed financing and bare-bones transportation spending plans were more often the order of the day.
- Several states considered gas tax increases this year, but as in 2010, no state approved an increase.
- States continue to put some hope in privatization to help meet their infrastructure needs.
- Some states will experiment with alternative revenue mechanisms in the next year.

- Some states will study the transportation finance problem and hope the studies will identify solutions.

http://knowledgecenter.csq.org/drupal/system/files/State_Transp_Finance_2011.pdf

Financial Analysis of Transportation-Related Public Private Partnerships

US Office of Inspector General, July 2011

The U.S. Department of Transportation's Office of Inspector General has released a report that identifies financial disadvantages to the public sector of Public Private Partnership (PPP) transactions compared to more traditional public financing methods, discusses factors that allow the public sector to derive financial value from PPP transactions, and assesses the extent to which PPPs can close the infrastructure funding gap.

<http://www.oig.dot.gov/sites/dot/files/PPP%20Final%20Report%207-28-2011%20508%20PDF.pdf>

2011-2012 Policies for the Jurisdiction of the Transportation Committee

National Council of State Legislatures; 2011

Transportation Financing Policy Recommendations

Finance

View the following recommendations regarding aviation financing viewed as a comprehensive package and not as individual parts implemented piecemeal.

Recognizing the safety, security, economic, and other broad public benefits of the services provided by the Federal Aviation Administration, NCSL supports efforts to:

- Continue a General Fund contribution, due to military and federal usage of airport facilities and services. Maintain the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, financed by existing dedicated user taxes and charges, as the primary method of funding federal-aid aviation projects. Any federal aviation fees collected from airline ticket taxes that are diverted to non-aviation purposes should be rededicated or repealed. NCSL supports federal grant assurance provisions barring diversion of airport revenue to non-airport purposes.
- Maintain the current structure of federal aviation taxes which equitably distributes the financial burden on all users.
- Continue to fully fund the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) at authorized levels annually on a multi-year basis to help support needed safety, security, capacity and noise projects;
- Authorize states to use Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funds for increased security measures required by federal law at a 100-percent federal share;
- Provide states maximum flexibility in the prioritization and administration of trust fund allocations, this includes aviation-related planning activities being an allowable expense;
- Remove the Trust Fund from the federal unified budget;
- Create a mechanism to guarantee that all revenue dedicated to the Trust Fund is spent each year for its intended purpose and that Trust Fund revenue is classified as "mandatory" spending and operate as a "pay-as-you-go" program;
- Remove statutory or regulatory barriers to state and locally-generated revenues that support airport activities;

- Reduce aircraft noise and a continued set-aside of AIP funds for noise abatement projects;
- Continue the Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs) as a supplementary revenue source to finance airport needs;
- Exempt from federal tax laws airport municipal bonds; and
- Allow the use of innovative financing methods, such as state infrastructure banks and revolving loans, whenever possible to enable states to meet the funding needs of smaller airports.

<http://www.ncsl.org/default.aspx?TabID=773&tabs=854,15,699#699>

Transportation Governance and Finance: A 50-State Review of State Legislatures and Departments of Transportation

A joint project of the National Conference of State Legislatures and the AASHTO Center for Excellence in Project Finance, May 2011

The National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) and the Center for Excellence in Project Finance at the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) partnered to produce an authoritative review of transportation governance and finance for all 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. The report, *Transportation Governance and Finance: a 50-State Review . . .* is primarily about the roles and relationships among the branches of state government most active in transportation issues.

http://www.transportationfinance.org/pdf/50_State_Review_State_Legislatures_Departments_Transportation.pdf

Performance Driven: Achieving Wiser Investment in Transportation

Bipartisan Policy Center, June 16, 2011

For years, there has been overwhelming evidence that the U.S. is failing to maintain its highways, bridges, and transit systems, and consistently falling short in making the infrastructure investments needed to provide for the long-term needs of our growing population and economy. The recognition that we are under-investing in our transportation systems, however, has run headlong into a political and fiscal environment in which expanding federal expenditures for any purpose is increasingly difficult to discuss, much less to enact. In this context, it is arguably more important than ever to ensure that all federal resources directed to transportation—albeit never enough to keep pace with the nation’s vast and growing transportation needs—are invested wisely.

<http://www.bipartisanpolicy.org/library/report/performance-driven-achieving-wiser-investment-transportation>

Access for Value: Financing Transportation Through Land Value Capture Transportation, Infrastructure, Environment

David M. Levinson, R.P. Braun-CTS Chair of Transportation Engineering, University of Minnesota; Emilia Istrate, Senior Research Analyst, Metropolitan Policy Program; The Brookings Institution; April 28, 2011

The worsening financial state of the federal, state, and local governments is a frequent subject in media and political circles. As discretionary expenditures, transportation programs likely face significant changes if they are to cope with spending cuts across all levels of government.

These changes would require not only reprioritizing the use of scarce funds, cutting ineffective programs, and improving the performance of remaining programs, but also encouraging states and local partners to find other sources of funding for transportation.

Measuring accessibility is an essential tool in such a makeover because it reveals the benefits of a transportation system. Accessibility is the ease of reaching valued destinations, such as jobs, shops, schools, entertainment, and recreation. As such, accessibility creates value. Capturing some of this value would allow state and local governments to invest in the operations, maintenance, and in some cases expansion of their transportation networks. Accessibility, as an outcome-oriented metric, can effectively assess transportation's economic impact, and capturing the value of accessibility would help states and metropolitan areas develop sustainable transportation funding streams.

This study examines accessibility and its importance in assessing transportation performance and in creating a sustainable transportation funding source. It first delineates the concept of accessibility by comparing it with a common transportation performance metric, mobility. The paper then explains how accessibility can help fund transportation through a virtuous circle: infrastructure creates access, access creates value, and value captured to fund infrastructure. Download the PDF:

http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2011/0428_transportation_funding_levinson_istrate.aspx

Infrastructure 2011: A Strategic Priority

Jonathan D. Miller, et al; Urban Land Institute and Ernst & Young; Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute, 2011

Cover Letter

Infrastructure 2011: A Strategic Priority is the fifth in a series of annual reports coproduced by the Urban Land Institute and Ernst & Young. Each year, we assess infrastructure policy and initiatives in the United States and around the world, examine future trends, and recommend approaches for infrastructure investment strategies to help enable long-term regional growth and prosperity. The report is based on interviews with infrastructure experts, and information gathered at infrastructure forums and up-to-date research. . .

http://www.uli.org/ResearchAndPublications/PolicyPracticePriorityAreas/Infrastructure/~/_media/Documents/ResearchAndPublications/Reports/Infrastructure/Infrastructure2011.ashx

The Forum on Funding and Financing Transportation Conference Report

AASHTO Center for Excellence in Project Finance; Proceedings from September 30, 2010 Conference; January 2011

In recognition of the need to discuss a broad range of tools to address the transportation "funding gap," the AASHTO Center for Excellence in Project Finance convened a forum on September 30, 2010, at the Capitol Visitor Center in Washington, DC, for members of Congress, Congressional staff, and transportation industry stakeholders.

The forum, entitled *Funding and Financing Solutions for Surface Transportation in the Coming Decade* was organized around six discussions that addressed:

- Near- and medium-term funding options for the Federal surface transportation programs
- Current and potential future applications of Federal financing tools

- Funding and financing initiatives that are meeting with success at state and local levels of government and whose use could be expanded

Forum speakers included members of Congress, representatives of state and local governments, and professionals from educational and private sector transportation-focused organizations and businesses.

http://www.transportation-finance.org/pdf/featured_documents/sep_30_report_final_2011_02_02.pdf

Puget Sound Regional Transportation Funding Study

Prepared at the Evans School of Public Affairs at the University of Washington in a collaborative effort with the Washington Roundtable, 2010

The Evans School at the University of Washington, Seattle, WA; faculty and students have completed a study of the prospects for the finance of transportation systems in the Central Puget Sound Region. The report covers King, Snohomish, Pierce, and Kitsap counties in the forthcoming fourteen year period (2009 to 2023). The study demonstrates clearly the challenges to financing transportation systems, especially in face of increasing transportation demand grounded in the region's expected population and job growth.

The study used budget information and historical trends from public agencies including the Washington Department of Transportation, county governments and transit agencies, and state records on the experience of cities. Projection tools were developed to extend the information across the time-frame of the study. Several public agencies offered formal or informal comments as the work unfolded. The research benefitted from exchanges of information with staff at the Puget Sound Regional Council who simultaneously have worked on a longer-term look at regional transportation finance to support the on-going *Transportation 2040* planning exercise. The team including in faculty members Leslie Breitner and Dan Carlson and two graduate students consulting with former state transportation secretary Doug MacDonald, are grateful for the assistance received.

The results of the study show prospects under *current revenue authorities*:

1. From what sources funds for transportation systems will be raised
2. Who will direct spending to specific projects and programs
3. In what manner the flow of revenues will cover current requirements such as maintenance and operations of the systems
4. What likely funding capacities will be available for capital investment, both in system preservation and system expansion, considering separately the region's state highways, county roads, city streets, local county transit systems, and Sound Transit.

http://evans.washington.edu/files/Transportation_finance_final_report.pdf

State Transportation Finance Legislation & Trends 2010

The Council of State Governments; 2010

Traditional revenue sources that fund transportation are dwindling and are also threatened by competing needs in other sectors of government.

- No state increased its gasoline tax in 2010 and only a handful did in 2009.1
- Americans are paying the lowest gasoline taxes since the early days of the automobile—just \$19 for every 1,000 miles driven. That's despite the fact that Americans are driving

more miles than they did a decade ago and causing more wear and tear on the nation's highways and bridges.²

- In South Carolina, the gas tax hasn't been increased since 1987 and is the fourth lowest in the nation. However, lawmakers will consider a proposal next year to raise the gasoline tax by 5.5 cents from 16.75 cents to
- 22.25 cents a gallon.³
- In Florida, Gov. Charlie Crist had to use a line-item veto to prevent a raid on the state's road-building fund that would have gone to schools.⁴
- Some Arizona lawmakers wanted to raise the state's vehicle registration fees this year not to fund highway and bridge improvements, but to maintain state parks and reopen shuttered highway rest areas. The legislation failed to win final passage.⁵

http://knowledgecenter.csg.org/drupal/system/files/State_Transportation_Finance_Legislation_Trends_2010_1.pdf

Council of State Governments Transportation Fact and Figures Website

Council of State Governments (CSG) Website; 2010

While the election, the economy and other factors made it a difficult year to raise new state revenues for transportation, 2010 saw states turning to bonding as a key financing strategy. Interest in public-private partnerships remained high. States also explored alternative finance mechanisms and revenue streams. One state's regional approach to transportation funding could be what we ultimately remember about 2010.

<http://knowledgecenter.csg.org/drupal/content/state-transportation-finance-legislation-trends-2010>

Transportation and Infrastructure Finance

A Council of State Governments (CSG) national report by Sean Slone; CSG; 2008

This report examines the transportation funding issues states face, the finance options available to them, and how states can decide which options best fit into their transportation plans. It draws on the work of two federal commissions created by Congress—the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission and the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission—as well as the research and assessment of numerous other transportation, law and tax policy analysts, expert panels, and state and federal officials.

<http://www.csg.org/knowledgecenter/docs/TransportationInfrastructureFinance.pdf>

State Legislation in 2010 and 2011

Enacted, pending, and failed laws or ballot measures related to transportation finance in the United States outside of Washington in 2010 and 2011. Information sources: National Council of State Legislatures, Center for Transportation Excellence, and state legislative websites.

Alabama

Year: 2010

Status: Enacted
Topics: Transportation appropriations
Citation: SB 121

Bill Information: <http://www.openbama.org/index.php/bill/display/533>

Summary: Proposes an amendment to the Constitution of Alabama, to transfer \$100 million per year for a ten year period for a road and bridge construction program to be funded with appropriations from the Alabama Trust Fund. Also provides for a transfer of funds to the County and Municipal Government Capital Improvement Fund. (Last Update: 5/10/2010)

Bill History: Read for the first time and referred to the Senate committee on Finance and Taxation General Fund on 1/12/10. Read for the second time and placed on the calendar amendment on 1/14/10. Finance and Taxation General Fund amendment offered on 1/19/10. Third reading on 1/28/10. Passed the Senate on 3/11/10. Introduced in the House and referred to the Government Appropriations on 3/23/10. Amended and passed by the House - sent to the Senate for concurrence on 4/13/10. Senate refused to concur on 4/14/10 and sent to conference committee. Conference committee accepted on 4/22/10. Became law without governor's signature on 4/22/10.

Year: 2010
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Transit funding
Citation: HB 116

Bill Information: <http://www.openbama.org/index.php/bill/display/235>

Summary: Proposes to use funds derived from fees and taxes from the use and operation of motor vehicles and motor vehicle fuels for public transportation. (Last Update: 5/10/2010)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the House Appropriations Committee on 1/12/10. Indefinitely postponed on 4/14/10.

Alaska

Year: 2011
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Other funding mechanisms
Citation: HB 31

Bill Information: http://www.legis.state.ak.us/basis/get_bill.asp?session=27&bill=hb31

Summary: Creates the Alaska Transportation Infrastructure Fund. Appropriates \$1,000,000,000 from the general fund. Takes effect only if an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Alaska establishing the transportation infrastructure fund as a dedicated fund is approved by the voters before April 1, 2013. (Last Update: 6/1/2011)

Year: 2011

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Tolling

Citation: SB 80

Bill Information: http://www.legis.state.ak.us/basis/get_bill.asp?session=27&bill=sb80

Summary: Relates to the authority and obligations of the Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority, to bonds of the authority, and to reserve funds of the authority; authorizes the state to provide support for certain obligations of the authority; relates to taxes and assessments on a person that is a party to an agreement with the authority; establishes the Knik Arm Crossing fund. (Last Update: 6/1/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Transportation Committee on 2/4/11. Moved out of the Transportation Committee on 2/16/11. Referred to the Finance Committee on 2/16/11. Died - session ended.

Arkansas

Year: 2011

Status: Enacted

Topics: Public private partnerships | Transit funding

Citation: HB 1842

Bill Information: <http://www.arkansashouse.org/bill/2011R/HB1842>

Summary: Allows regional mobility authorities to enter into public private partnerships for rail, waterway, and trail projects. (Last Update: 4/4/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Committee on Public Transportation on 3/3/11. Passed out of Committee and referred to the House on 3/8/11. Passed the House and referred to the Senate on 3/9/11. Passed the Senate and returned to the House for enrollment on 3/16/11. Signed by the Governor on 3/24/11.

Year: 2011

Status: Enacted

Topics: Motor Fuel Tax | Other funding mechanisms | Sales Tax

Citation: HB 1902

Bill Information: <http://www.arkansashouse.org/bill/2011R/HB1902>

Summary: Proposes a 5-cent diesel fuel tax increase that will finance a bond for maintenance and improvements to the states highway system. Allows the state DOT to issue GARVEE bonds. Must be approved by voters in a statewide election. (Last Update: 10/5/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the House Public Transportation on 3/4/11. Passed out of committee on 3/10/11. Passed the House and referred to the Senate on 3/11/11. Introduced and referred to the Senate Transportation Committee on 3/14/11. Passed out of

committee on 3/23/11. Amended and passed the Senate on 3/24/11. Passed the House as amended and sent to the Governor on 3/25/11. Signed by the Governor on 3/30/11.

Year: 2011

Status: Enacted

Topics: Bonding and debt instruments | Sales Tax

Citation: HJR 1001

Bill Information: <http://www.arkansashouse.org/bill/2011R/HJR1001>

Summary: Proposes a constitutional amendment to raise the sales tax by 0.5% for 10 years, for state, county and city surface transportation projects. Dedicates state's portion of revenues to securing general obligation bonds for up to \$1.3 billion to finance a statewide four-lane highway program. Permanently dedicates one cent per gallon of existing motor fuel and diesel taxes to State Aid Street Fund. All provisions must be approved by voters in statewide election. (Last Update: 10/5/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to Committee on State Agencies and Governmental Affairs on 2/3/11. Passed out of Committee and referred to the House on 3/22/11. Adopted by House and referred to the Senate on 3/24/11. Adopted by the Senate and returned to the House for enrollment on 3/31/11. Approved by the Governor on 4/4/11.

Arizona

Year: 2011

Status: Enacted

Topics: Public private partnerships

Citation: SB 1270

Summary: Transportation Omnibus. Broadens the definition of "Eligible Facility" to include bridges, tunnels, airports, driver licensing facilities, administrative buildings or other buildings, rest areas, maintenance yards or energy systems. Allows for concession agreements to contain clauses for rents, advertising, sponsorship fees, or service fees. Allows AZDOT to continue or ceasing collecting tolls, user fees or fares once the agreement ends. (Last Update: 5/20/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 1/27/11. Passed the Senate on 2/28/11. Introduced and referred to the House Rules and Transportation Committees on 3/2/11. Passed the Transportation Committee on 3/17/11. Signed by the Governor on 4/19/11.

Connecticut

Year: 2011

Status: Enacted

Topics: Other funding mechanisms | Transit funding | Transportation appropriations

Citation: HB 6652

Bill Information:

http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=HB-6652

Summary: Makes changes and budget adjustments. Adjusts planned transit fare increases. Establishes a procedure for the state DOT to raise transit fares. Eliminates the New Haven Line Revitalization Account within the Special Transportation Fund. Eliminates the Transportation Strategy Board but retains the board's projects account within the Special Transportation Fund. Allocates certain revenues to the Special Transportation Fund, including motor vehicle sales tax revenue. Decreases general fund transfer to Special Transportation Fund. (Last Update: 9/30/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 6/5/11. Passed House and referred to Senate on 6/6/11. Passed Senate on 6/7/11. Signed by the Governor on 6/21/11. Public Act No. 11-61 on 6/21/11.

Year: 2011

Status: Enacted

Topics: Local taxes and fees | Motor Fuel Tax | Other transportation fees | Registration fees | Sales Tax | Transportation appropriations

Citation: SB 1239

Bill Information:

http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=SB-1239

Summary: Biennial budget act; most provisions take effect July 1, 2011. Increases the base tax on diesel fuel from 26 cents to 29 cents per gallon. Imposes a 3-cent-per-gallon inventory tax on diesel for licensed sellers. Raises various license fees, truck weight fees and registration fees for passenger motor vehicles, motorcycles, commercial vehicles, electric vehicles and others. Adjusts sales taxes on vehicle sales and rentals. Raises fine for failing to change out-of-state registration, proceeds from which are allocated to the municipalities in which the violations occurred. Specifies amounts to be transferred to the Special Transportation Fund and to the Transportation Strategy Board projects account within that fund. Makes appropriations to the state DOT. See also House Bill 6652 (enacted) for subsequent budget adjustments and taxes. (Last Update: 9/30/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 5/2/11. Passed Senate and referred to House on 5/2/11. Passed House on 5/3/11. Signed by the Governor on 5/4/11. Public Act No. 11-6 on 5/10/11.

Year: 2011

Status: Pending

Topics: Tolling

Citation: HB 6200

Bill Information:

http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=HB-6200

Summary: Authorizes the state DOT to toll new highways or highway extensions. (Last Update: 7/19/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 1/26/11. Referred to the Joint Committee on Transportation on 3/17/11. Passed out of committee on 3/18/11. Referred to Office of Legislative Research and

Office of Fiscal Analysis on 3/29/11. Referred by House to Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding on 4/12/11. Tabled for the House Calendar on 5/10/11. Passed the House and introduced on 6/2/11.

Florida

Year: 2010
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Public private partnerships
Citation: HB 1343

Bill Information:

<http://www.myfloridahouse.gov/Sections/Bills/billsdetail.aspx?BillId=44117&SessionIndex=-1&SessionId=64&BillText=&BillNumber=&BillSponsorIndex=0&BillListIndex=0&BillStatuteText=&BillTypeIndex=0&BillReferredIndex=0&HouseChamber=H&BillSearchIndex=13>

Summary: Relates to public-private partnership infrastructure projects. Provides for state agencies and local governments to receive or solicit proposals to enter into public works infrastructure project agreements with a private entity, or consortium of private entities, to build, operate, or finance public works infrastructure project. Provides criteria for selection of project and private entity. Requires all reasonable costs to state related to project to be borne by private entity. Identical to SB 2444 (Last Update: 5/10/2010)

Bill History: Prefilled on 2/25/10. Introduced on 3/2/10. Referred to Governmental Affairs Policy; Government Operations Appropriations; Economic Development & Community Affairs Policy Council on 3/10/10. Died in committee on 4/30/10.

Year: 2011
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Public private partnerships
Citation: HB 1313

Bill Information: <http://www.flsenate.gov/Session/Bill/2011/1313>

Summary: Establishes the Florida Public-Private Partnership Act; provides for private entities to develop and operate public-purpose projects; provides for procurement, consideration, and approval of projects; provides exemption from Consultant's Competitive Negotiation Act and any DMS interpretations, regulations, or guidelines; provides for affected local governments to comment on proposed projects; requires public entities to adopt and make publicly available specified guidelines for public-private agreements, etc. Identical to SB 1956. (Last Update: 5/20/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 3/8/11. Referred to the Senate Committee on Community Affairs; the Committee on Governmental Oversight and Accountability; and, the Budget Committee on 3/16/11. Indefinitely postponed and withdrawn from consideration on 5/7/11.

Georgia

Year: 2010
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Sales Tax | Transit funding
Citation: HB 1218

Bill Information: <http://www.legis.ga.gov/Legislation/en-US/display/20092010/HB/1218>

Summary: Entitled the Transportation Investment Act of 2010. Would divide the state into 12 regions and each region would then vote on a 1 cent sales tax, which would then be used for transportation purposes. Would do away with the requirement that state transportation money be equally divided among the state's congressional districts by allocating the money to special regional districts. Would suspend MARTA's local sales and use tax from January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012.

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the House Transportation Committee on 2/17/10. Read a second time on 2/18/10. Passed out of committee 3/18/10.

Hawaii

Year: 2011
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Registration fees
Citation: HB 1101

Bill Information: http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/measure_indiv.aspx?billtype=HB&billnumber=%201101

Summary: Raises vehicle registration fees from \$25 to \$45 and deposits the funds into state highway fund. (Last Update: 6/1/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 1/26/11 and referred to the House Finance and Transportation Committees. Passed out of committee on 2/26/11. Passes the House on 3/8/11. Introduced in the Senate and referred to the Senate Transportation and Finance Committees on 3/10/11. Died - session ended. Carried over to 2012.

Year: 2011
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Motor Fuel Tax
Citation: HB 1531

Bill Information: http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/measure_indiv.aspx?billtype=HB&billnumber=%201531

Summary: Raises the gasoline tax for six years. (Last Update: 3/4/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the House Transportation and Finance Committees on 1/26/11. Passed out of the Transportation Committee on 2/7/11; passed out of the Finance Committee on 2/15/11. Bill deferred on 3/1/11.

Year: 2011

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Motor Fuel Tax | Other funding mechanisms | Registration fees | Vehicle Miles Tax

Citation: SB 1131

Bill Information:

http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/measure_indiv.aspx?billtype=SB&billnumber=%201131

Summary: Increases the gasoline tax, the vehicle registration fee, and the state vehicle weight fee. Establishes the land transportation modernization special fund. Provides funding for a six-year comprehensive modernization program. Establishes the vehicle miles traveled pilot program and other pilot programs to test alternatives to the state and county system of motor vehicle fuel taxes. (Last Update: 6/1/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Senate Transportation Committee on 1/26/11. Died - session ended. Carried over to 2012.

Year: 2011

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Vehicle Miles Tax

Citation: SB 819

Bill Information:

http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/measure_indiv.aspx?billtype=SB&billnumber=%20819

Summary: Authorizes the department of transportation to establish a vehicle miles traveled pilot program and under that pilot program, evaluate the use of a vehicle miles traveled user fee. Authorizes the department to establish one or more pilot programs to test alternatives to the existing state and county system of motor vehicle fuel taxes. Authorizes the department of transportation to refund motor vehicle fuel taxes under any pilot program. (Last Update: 6/1/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Senate Transportation Committee on 1/24/11. Passed out Committee and passed a second reading on 1/28/11. Referred to the Senate Ways and Means Committee on 2/2/11. Died - session ended. Carried over to 2012.

Idaho

2010 Ballot Measure

The amendment would allow airports in the state to take on debt for endeavors that would improve facilities, equipment, and acquisitions such as real property. Debts would have to be paid off using airport revenues instead of using taxpayer money.

Approved with 55% of the vote.

Ballot information: <http://www.legislature.idaho.gov/legislation/2010/HJR005.htm>

Illinois

Year: 2010
Status: Enacted
Topics: Public private partnerships
Citation: SB 3659

Bill Information:

<http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/BillStatus.asp?DocNum=3659&GAID=10&DocTypeID=SB&SessionID=76&GA=96>

Summary: Creates the Public Private Agreement for the Illiana Expressway Act; permits the Department of Transportation to, pursuant to a competitive request for qualifications, enter into public private agreements to develop, construct, manage, or operate the expressway; provides that contractors may receive certain revenues, including user fees, in consideration of the payment of moneys to the State for that right; establishes provisions concerning procurement, tolls, prevailing wages, user fees, and other matters. (Last Update: 6/23/2010)

Bill History: Signed by the Governor on 6/9/10.

Year: 2011
Status: Enacted
Topics: Public private partnerships
Citation: HB 1091

Bill Information:

<http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/BillStatus.asp?DocNum=1091&GAID=11&DocTypeID=HB&SessionID=84&GA=97>

Summary: Creates the Public-Private Partnerships for Transportation Act. Grants to the Illinois Department of Transportation and the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority the necessary powers for the development, financing, and operation of transportation projects through public-private agreements with one or more private entities. Contains provisions regarding procurement, agreements, development and operations standards for transportation projects, financial arrangements, acquisition of property, labor matters, law enforcement, property, powers, prohibitions, and other matters. (Last Update: 8/30/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Rule Committee on 2/4/11. Assigned to the Judiciary Committee on 2/8/11. Passed out of the Judiciary Committee on 2/23/11. Passed out of the House and introduced on the Senate on 4/12/11. Passed the Senate on 5/20/11. House concurs with Senate amendments on 5/28/11. Sent to the Governor on 6/24/11. Signed by the Governor on 8/23/11. Public Act 97-0502

Indiana

Year: 2010
Status: Enacted
Topics: Public private partnerships
Citation: SB 382

Bill Information:

<http://www.in.gov/apps/lisa/session/billwatch/billinfo?year=2010&session=1&request=getBill&doctype=SB&docno=0382>

Summary: For purposes of statutes concerning approval of the location of a tollway or the designation of a state highway as a tollway, allows the designation of the Illiana Expressway as a tollway (current law prohibits such a designation without legislative authorization). For purposes of the statutes governing public-private agreements by the Indiana finance authority or the department of transportation concerning toll roads or tollways, authorizes a public-private agreement for a project concerning the Illiana Expressway (current law prohibits such an agreement without legislative authorization) that would permit an operator to impose tolls for the operation of motor vehicles. Specifies that the common construction wage statute applies to a project for the Illiana Expressway. (Last Update: 3/26/2010)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Transportation & Veterans Affairs on 1/12/10. Passed out of committee on 1/21/10. Passed the Senate and referred to the House on 1/28/10. Introduced to the House Committee on Roads and Transportation on 2/8/10. Passed out of committee on 2/22/10. Passed the House on 2/25/10. Senate concurred with House amendments on 3/2/10. Sent to the Governor on 3/16/10. Signed by the Governor on 3/18/10.

Year: 2011
Status: Enacted
Topics: Public private partnerships
Citation: SB 473

Bill Information:

<http://www.in.gov/apps/lisa/session/billwatch/billinfo?year=2011&session=1&request=getBill&doctype=SB&docno=0473>

Summary: Removes certain provisions requiring legislative approval or review by the budget committee for public private agreements, toll roads, and tollways. Transfers the approval process directly to the governor. Retains provisions requiring legislative approval for certain projects concerning the construction of Interstate Highway 69 and the designation of a toll road on a part of an interstate highway south of Indianapolis. Removes the July 1, 2015 expiration date regarding the removal of the requirement recognizing the location of certain tollways, converting part of I-69 to a tollway, issuing requests for proposals and entering into PPP agreements for certain highway projects. (Last Update: 5/20/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Transportation & Veterans Affairs on 1/13/11. Reassigned to the Committee on Appropriations on 1/31/11. Passed out of committee on 2/17/11. Passed the Senate on 2/22/11 and referred to

the House. Introduced in the House and referred to the Committee on Roads and Transportation on 3/28/11. Passed out of the committee on 4/8/11. Passed the House and sent back to the Senate with amendments on 4/15/11. Conference committee appointed on 4/28/11. Agreed to on 4/29/11. Signed by the Governor on 5/10/11.

Year: 2011
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Other funding mechanisms
Citation: HB 1243

Bill Information:

<http://www.in.gov/apps/lisa/session/billwatch/billinfo?year=2011&session=1&request=getBill&doctype=HB&docno=1243>

Summary: Imposes an annual electric motor vehicle highway maintenance fee of \$100 on each electric motor vehicle registered in the state. (Last Update: 6/2/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Committee on Roads and Transportation on 1/12/11. Died - session ended.

Kansas

Year: 2010
Status: Enacted
Topics: Aviation development | Bonding and debt instruments | Design-build | Registration fees | Sales Tax | Transit funding
Citation: HB 2650

Bill Information: <http://www.kansas.gov/government/legislative/bills/2010/2650.pdf>

Summary: Establishes the Transportation Works for Kansas (T-Works) Program. Provides expenditures for preservation projects; expansion and economic opportunity projects; modernization projects (such as widening lanes or shoulders and upgrading interchanges); assistance to cities and counties; railroad, aviation, and public transit programs; and a multi-modal economic development program to provide assistance for transportation-sensitive economic opportunities on a local or a regional basis. Would authorize the DOT to procure one demonstration project in Johnson or Wyandotte County that would use the design-build concept. The bill increases revenues by: increasing registration fees for smaller vehicles (generally, less than 12,000 lbs.), trailers, and buses by \$20; increasing registration fees for trucks 54,000 lbs. and smaller by \$100; and, increasing registration fees for trucks larger than 54,000 lbs. by \$135. The bill increases the transfer from the State Highway Fund to assist transit, rail, and aviation starting in 2013. The bill also would authorize the Secretary to transfer moneys from the State Highway Fund to the Rail Service Improvement Fund and vice versa. The bill also specifies that, between July 1, 2010, and June 30, 2020, \$8 million is to be spent in each county for transportation projects. The bill expands KDOT's bonding authority. Allows municipalities to use loans from the Transportation Revolving Fund for projects. The bill would allow the Secretary to recommend construction of a new toll or turnpike project or the designation of an existing

highway or portion thereof as a toll or turnpike project if a feasibility study provides a favorable result. (Last Update: 6/24/2010)

Bill History: Introduced on 2/4/10. Referred to the House Transportation Committee on 2/5/10. Passed out of committee on 2/16/10. Passed the House and referred to the Senate on 2/18/10. Referred to the Senate Transportation Committee on 2/19/10. Passed out of committee on 3/30/10. Passed the Senate as amended by the Transportation Committee on 5/7/10 and referred back to the House for concurrence. House concurred on 5/11/10.

Maine

Year: 2011
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Bonding and debt instruments
Citation: SP 136

Bill Information: http://www.mainelegislature.org/legis/bills/display_ps.asp?LD=432&snum=125

Summary: Authorizes the Maine Municipal Bond Bank to issue \$15,000,000 in federally authorized GARVEE bonds, to be repaid with federal transportation funds, the proceeds of which will be used by the Department of Transportation for bridge repairs to the Interstate 95 Bridge at the Maine and New Hampshire border known as the Piscataqua River Bridge. (Last Update: 6/1/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 2/9/11. Referred to the Joint Committee on Transportation on 2/15/11. Placed in Legislative Files (DEAD)

Year: 2011
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Bonding and debt instruments
Citation: SP 199

Bill Information: http://www.mainelegislature.org/legis/bills/display_ps.asp?LD=618&snum=125

Summary: Authorizes the Maine Municipal Bond Bank to issue \$35,000,000 in federally authorized GARVEE bonds, to be repaid with federal transportation funds, the proceeds of which will be used by the Department of Transportation to repair the Memorial Bridge, which carries Route 1 across the Piscataqua River, programmed in the 2012-2013 biennium. (Last Update: 6/1/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 2/16/11. Referred to the Joint Transportation Committee on 2/17/11. Placed in Legislative Files (DEAD)

Year: 2011
Status: Pending
Topics: Bonding and debt instruments

Citation: SP 282

Bill Information: http://www.mainelegislature.org/legis/bills/display_ps.asp?LD=894&snum=125

Summary: Proposes a bond issue in the amount of \$62,000,000, which will be used to repair and reconstruct highways and bridges that are considered vital to the expansion of business interests by the business and economic development sector and essential to public safety. Requires that the Department of Transportation consult with the business and economic development sector to determine projects of highest priority to the business and economic development sector. (Last Update: 4/6/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 3/4/11. Referred to the Joint Transportation Committee on 3/8/11.

Maryland

Year: 2010

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Motor Fuel Tax

Citation: HB 479

Bill Information: <http://mlis.state.md.us/2010rs/billfile/hb0479.htm>

Summary: Increases the motor fuel tax rates for motor fuels other than aviation gasoline or turbine fuel by 2 cents per gallon on July 1, 2010, and by 2 cents per gallon on July 1 of each year in 2011 through 2014; provides for the payment of specified motor fuel taxes on tax paid motor fuel by specified dates. (Last Update: 5/11/2010)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means on 2/1/10. Died - session ended on 4/13/10.

Year: 2011

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Sales Tax | Transit funding

Citation: SB 451

Bill Information: <http://mlis.state.md.us/2011rs/billfile/sb0451.htm>

Summary: Distributes 25% of the funds from the sales and use tax on gasoline in Montgomery County to the Mass Transit Facility Revenue Account. Creates the Mass Transit Facility Revenue Account for projects in Montgomery, Baltimore and Prince George's county. Directs the state comptroller to set the fuel sales and use tax quarterly based on the average of the selling price during the previous quarter. (Last Update: 6/1/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee on 2/4/11. Died - session ended.

Year: 2011

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Motor Fuel Tax | Other funding mechanisms | Registration fees

Citation: SB 714

Bill Information: <http://mlis.state.md.us/2011rs/billfile/sb0714.htm>

Summary: Creates the Transportation Trust Fund. Raises the motor fuel tax rate from 23.5 cents/gallon to 33.5 cents/gallon beginning July 1, 2013. Indexes the motor fuel rate to the Construction Cost Index - limits the increase to not more than one cent. Raises vehicle registration fees. Identical to HB 1001. (Last Update: 6/1/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Senate Budget and Taxation on 2/4/11. Died - session ended.

Massachusetts

Year: 2011

Status: Pending

Topics: Other funding mechanisms

Citation: HB 2659

Bill Information: <http://www.malegislature.gov/Bills/187/House/H02659>

Summary: Develops a transportation tax credit for individual and families of moderate means; directs gas tax revenues; allows cities and towns to charge a tax on commercial parking; regulates existing tolls and discounts. (Last Update: 4/6/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 1/21/11. Referred to the Joint Committee on Transportation on 2/25/11.

Year: 2011

Status: Pending

Topics: Registration fees | Vehicle Miles Tax

Citation: HB 2660

Bill Information: <http://www.malegislature.gov/Bills/187/House/H02660>

Summary: Raises registration fees for passenger vehicles. Creates a pilot project to study the challenges of implementing a vehicle miles traveled fee. (Last Update: 4/6/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 1/21/11. Referred to the Joint Transportation Committee on 2/25/11.

Michigan

Year: 2010

Status: Enacted

Topics: Public private partnerships

Citation: HB 5461

Bill Information:

<http://www.legislature.mi.gov/%28S%28b0zqdg55fbium45draaw555%29%29/mileg.aspx?page=GetObject&objectname=2009-HB-5461>

Summary: Provides for private investment of infrastructure funding; authorizes the acquisition and disposal of interests in real and personal property; authorizes certain public and private entity partnerships; authorizes the creation and implementation of certain plans and negotiated benefit areas; authorizes the use of tax increment financing; promotes economic development. (Last Update: 1/12/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the House Transportation Committee on 9/23/09. Passed out of committee on 12/15/09. Passed the House and sent to the Senate on 11/10/10. Signed by the Governor on 12/14/10.

Year: 2010, 2009

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Public private partnerships

Citation: HB 4961

Bill Information:

<http://www.legislature.mi.gov/%28S%28b0zqdg55fbium45draaw555%29%29/mileg.aspx?page=GetObject&objectname=2009-HB-4961>

Summary: Would allow the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) to enter into public- private agreements to design, construct, operate, or maintain a public transportation facility, with the approval of the Transportation Commission. Specifies the conditions that any public-private agreement would have to meet, including that the State would not have any liability for the acts or omissions of the concessionaire or other party to a public-private agreement. Allows the public-private agreement to provide for user fees and ancillary charges, including fees to control or manage traffic flow or volume. Requires the public transportation facility to revert from the concessionaire to MDOT at the end of a term specified in the agreement, if the agreement included an operations phase. Requires a public-private agreement for a new international bridge project to specify the risk assumed by each party, and require MDOT to ensure that the agreement provided for the most economically beneficial way for the State to perform the project while minimizing the State's liability for cost overruns and toll revenue shortfalls. Allows MDOT to solicit proposals or receive unsolicited proposals for a public-private agreement and require the Department to use a competitive selection process to the extent practicable. Allows MDOT to issue and sell bonds or notes to develop, acquire, construct, finance, maintain, or operate a public transportation facility under a public-private agreement. Requires that any bond or note would not constitute a pledge of the full faith and credit of the State or any political subdivision of the State. Establishes a civil fine of \$50 for failure to pay a user fee for use of a public transportation facility, and require the violator to pay twice the amount of the user fee to the facility operator. (Last Update: 1/12/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the House Transportation Committee on 5/19/09. Referred for a second reading on 4/29/10. Read a second time and recommended for a third reading on 5/26/10. Passed the House on 5/26/10. Introduced in the Senate on 6/1/10.

Year: 2010
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Motor Fuel Tax
Citation: HB 5769

Bill Information:

<http://www.legislature.mi.gov/%28S%28k1bgzk55ckcwt455k55pjh3q%29%29/mileg.aspx?page=getobject&objectname=2010-HB-5769&query=on>

Summary: Would increase the motor fuel tax from \$0.19/gallon to \$0.23/gallon on March 1, 2010; then increase it to \$0.27/gallon in 2013. (Last Update: 1/12/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to House Transportation Committee on 1/27/10.

Year: 2011
Status: Pending
Topics: Public private partnerships
Citation: HB 4131

Bill Information:

<http://www.legislature.mi.gov/%28S%283ol04gf2vdks03qjrvswj445%29%29/mileg.aspx?page=getobject&objectname=2011-HB-4131>

Summary: Would allow for public private partnerships for transportation infrastructure projects. Defines terms. Gives the State Transportation Commission the power to approve all PPPs. Requires the Commission to hold a hearing every 5 years to receive public comment on the facilities operated by a PPP. Specifies the terms that are required to be in the concession agreement. Limits the operating term to 50 years. Prohibits the concessionaire from condemning land. Allows the Commission to create Public Transportation Authorities. Gives them to power to enter into PPPs with DOT. (Last Update: 4/6/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the House Transportation Committee on 1/25/11.

Year: 2011
Status: Pending
Topics: Other funding mechanisms | Public private partnerships
Citation: SB 410

Bill Information:

<http://www.legislature.mi.gov/%28S%28xbrijgrer510sm3dtizujcir%29%29/mileg.aspx?page=getobject&objectname=2011-SB-0410>

Summary: Creates a governmental authority for new international trade crossings; to prescribe the powers and duties of the authority; to authorize procurement, design, finance, construction, maintenance, operation, improvement, and repair of new international bridges and approaches; to authorize certain agreements with public and private entities; to provide for the issuance of, and terms and conditions for, certain bonds; to provide for the imposition, collection, and enforcement of user fees and other charges; to provide for civil fines; to

authorize the acquisition, maintenance, and disposal of interests in real and personal property; to provide for certain duties of certain state and local departments and officers; to provide for the power to enter into interlocal agreements; to exempt certain property, income, and activities from tax; to make an appropriation; and to repeal acts and parts of acts. (Last Update: 7/19/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Senate Committee on Economic Development on 6/7/11.

Minnesota

Year: 2010

Status: Enacted

Topics: Transit funding | Transportation appropriations

Citation: HF 2700

Bill Information:

https://www.revisor.mn.gov/revisor/pages/search_status/status_detail.php?b=Senate&f=HF2700&ssn=0&y=2010

Summary: Omnibus bonding and capital improvement bill. Would provide \$43.5 million for transit construction. Shifts bonding authorization so it occurs sooner so that fiscal year 2011 and 2012 appropriations are increased from \$100 million to \$200 million. (Last Update: 3/22/2010)

Bill History: Introduced on 2/4/10. Passed out of House Ways and Means Committee on 2/11/10. Passed the House on 2/15/10. Introduced in the Senate on 2/16/10. Amended and passed in the Senate on 2/16/10. House refuses to concur on 2/16/10. House adopts report and passes on 2/22/10. Senate passes on 2/22/10. Reconsidered on 2/25/10. House and Senate pass bill on 3/11/10. Line item vetoed (all transit funding) on 3/15/10.

Year: 2011

Status: Vetoed by Governor

Topics: Transit funding | Transportation appropriations

Citation: HF 1140

Bill Information:

https://www.revisor.mn.gov/revisor/pages/search_status/status_detail.php?b=Senate&f=HF1140&ssn=0&y=2011

Summary: Transportation Omnibus. Shifts funding from the Minnesota Council on Transportation Access to be provided entirely through the MnDOT transit appropriation instead of a portion being provided through the Met Council appropriation which does not modify the amount of funding provided to the council. Eliminates all appropriations from the general fund for the MnDOT commuter and passenger rail activity for the biennium as well as on an ongoing basis, which amounts to a reduction of \$1 million. Reduces general fund appropriations for transit for the biennium (compared to the 2012-13 base appropriations), by \$7.62 million for greater Minnesota and \$129.78 million for the Twin Cities. Authorizes the Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) to transfer funds to the Metropolitan Council for bus operations,

subject to a referendum. Authorizes the Metropolitan Council to transfer funds to address transit operating deficits coming from (1) livable communities fund programs; (2) the right-of-way acquisition loan fund (RALF) program; and (3) budgeted funds for government affairs, public affairs, regional planning, and local planning assistance. (Last Update: 6/1/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Transportation Policy and Finance on 3/16/11. Committee report, to pass and referred to Ways and Means. Passed the House and referred to the Senate on 3/28/11. Referred to the Senate Rules and Administration Committee on 3/29/11. Amended on 4/4/11. Passed the Senate and referred back to the House for concurrence on 4/5/11. In conference committee on 4/11/11. Conference bill adopted in the House on 5/18/11. Conference bill adopted in the Senate on 5/19/11. Vetoed by the Governor on 5/24/11.

Missouri

Year: 2010
Status: Enacted
Topics: Port and waterway development
Citation: SB 578

Bill Information:

http://www.senate.mo.gov/10info/BTS_Web/Bill.aspx?SessionType=R&BillID=3157521

Summary: Would allow port authority boards to establish port improvement districts to fund projects with voter-approved sales taxes or property taxes. (Last Update: 11/11/2010)

Bill History: Introduced on 1/13/10. Referred to the Ways and Means Committee on 2/3/10. Passed out of committee on 2/8/10. Passed the Senate on 2/18/10. Introduced in the House on 2/18/10. Read a second time on 2/22/10. Referred to the House Job Creation and Economic Development Committee on 3/30/10. Passed out of committee on 4/13/10. Passed the House on 5/3/10. Signed by the Governor on 7/12/10.

Year: 2010
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Bonding and debt instruments | Tolling
Citation: SB 585

Bill Information:

http://www.senate.mo.gov/10info/BTS_Web/Bill.aspx?SessionType=r&BillID=3157515

Summary: Authorizes the DOT to construct, maintain, and operate toll facilities on the state highway system. The DOT is authorized to issue state toll facility revenue bonds to finance toll facility projects authorized by the General Assembly. Such bonds may be issued without the consent of the General Assembly. Bonds issued for toll facility projects shall not be deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the state and shall be payable solely from the state toll facility fund. Toll facility bonds shall be exempt from taxation. The DOT is required to obtain a study of the proposed toll facility project by one or more qualified independent consultants prior to commencing any project (Last Update: 2/25/2011)

Bill History: Introduced in the Senate on 1/6/10. Referred to the Senate Transportation Committee on 1/13/10.

Mississippi

Year: 2010
Status: Enacted
Topics: Bonding and debt instruments
Citation: SB 3181

Bill Information:

http://mdah.state.ms.us/arrec/digital_archives/series/files/sos2585/pdf/General/SB%203181.pdf

Summary: Authorizes more than \$300 million bonds to finances highways, bridges, and other transportation projects. Creates a commission consisting of the governor, treasurer and the attorney general that votes on issuing the bonds. (Last Update: 5/14/2010)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Senate Finance committee on 2/19/10. Passes the Senate on 2/24/10. Introduced in the House on 2/25/10. Passed as amended by the House on 3/15/10 and sent back to the Senate for concurrence. Conference committee report adopted by both houses on 3/26/10. Signed by the Governor on 4/14/10.

Montana

Year: 2011
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Public private partnerships
Citation: HB 563

Bill Information:

[http://laws.leg.mt.gov/laws11/LAW0203W\\$BSRV.ActionQuery?P_BLTP_BILL_TYP_CD=HB&P_BILL_NO=563&P_BILL_DFT_NO=&P_CHPT_NO=&Z_ACTION=Find&P_SBJ_DESCR=&P_SBJT_SBJ_CD=&P_LST_NM1=&P_ENTY_ID_SEQ=](http://laws.leg.mt.gov/laws11/LAW0203W$BSRV.ActionQuery?P_BLTP_BILL_TYP_CD=HB&P_BILL_NO=563&P_BILL_DFT_NO=&P_CHPT_NO=&Z_ACTION=Find&P_SBJ_DESCR=&P_SBJT_SBJ_CD=&P_LST_NM1=&P_ENTY_ID_SEQ=)

Summary: Authorized public private partnerships for transportation, water, or wastewater, public buildings, or any other public facility. Spells out what provisions may be included in a public private partnership agreement. Defines terms. (Last Update: 5/20/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 2/15/11. Referred to and passed out of the Business and Labor Committee on 2/18/11. Passed the House on 2/23/11. Read in the Senate on 3/2/11. Died in process on 4/28/11.

Nebraska

Year: 2010

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Motor Fuel Tax

Citation: LB 796

Bill Information: http://www.nebraskalegislature.gov/bills/view_bill.php?DocumentID=9875

Summary: Increases the motor fuel and compressed fuel taxes in the state by 5 cents per gallon, which has to be allocated for the completion of the state expressway system. Once completed the tax will terminate. (Last Update: 5/13/2010)

Bill History: Introduced on 1/8/10. Referred to the Revenue Committee on 1/11/10. Died - session ended on 4/16/10.

Year: 2011

Status: Enacted

Topics: Bonding and debt instruments | Sales Tax

Citation: LB 84

Bill Information: http://www.nebraskalegislature.gov/bills/view_bill.php?DocumentID=11707

Summary: Known as the Build Nebraska Act. Creates the State Highway Capital Improvement Fund. Earmarks 0.25 percent of existing sales tax, beginning in 2013, to fund roads and bridges. As introduced, would also have authorized bonding for up to \$500 million between July 1, 2013, and Dec. 31, 2018, for priority road and bridge projects; this section was removed before enactment. (Last Update: 10/4/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 1/6/11. Referred to the Revenue Committee on 1/10/11. Passed out of Committee and advanced to the Legislature on 2/17/11. Passed on the floor on 5/11/11. Signed by the Governor on 5/17/11.

Year: 2011

Status: Pending

Topics: Motor Fuel Tax

Citation: LB 504

Bill Information: http://www.nebraskalegislature.gov/bills/view_bill.php?DocumentID=12462

Summary: Would raise the current 7.5-cents per gallon to 11 cents in October. The tax would be hiked again in October 2012 to 15 cents per gallon. (Last Update: 2/15/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 1/18/11. Referred to the Revenue Committee on 1/20/11. Hearing scheduled for 2/10/11 on 1/26/11.

Nevada

Year: 2011

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Design-build | Public private partnerships | Tolling

Citation: SB 83

Bill Information: <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/76th2011/Reports/history.cfm?ID=177>

Summary: Allows the Department of Transportation to enter into public private partnership agreements to plan, design, construct, improve, finance, operate, and maintain eligible transportation facilities. Gives the DOT's Board of Directors the ability to charge user fees for use of the facility. Does away with the monetary thresholds for design-build projects. Adds toll bridges and toll projects to the list of projects that the DOT can authorize. (Last Update: 7/7/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 2/17/11. Passed out of committee on 4/27/11. Died - session ended on 6/7/11.

New Hampshire

Year: 2011

Status: Pending

Topics: Other funding mechanisms

Citation: SB 159

Bill Information:

http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/bill_status/Results.aspx?q=1&txtsessionyear=2011

Summary: Establishes a State Infrastructure Bank (SIB). The fund shall be managed by the state treasurer, shall be nonlapsing, and shall be continually appropriated. The SIB will be administered by the department of transportation and is authorized to contract with a third party for administration of the SIB fund. Spells out what funds in the SIB are authorized to be spent on. (Last Update: 4/6/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 2/3/11 and referred the Senate Transportation Committee. Passed out of committee and referred to the Senate Finance Committee on 3/23/11.

Year: 2011

Status: Pending

Topics: Motor Fuel Tax | Registration fees

Citation: SB 78

Bill Information:

http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/bill_status/Results.aspx?q=1&txtsessionyear=2011

Summary: Eliminates the motor vehicle registration fee increases enacted in 2009. Reduces the gasoline tax from \$0.18 per gallon to \$0.13. (Last Update: 6/1/2011)

Bill History: Introduced in the Senate on 1/19/11. Passed the Senate and referred to the House on 3/23/11. In the House Finance Committee on 4/26/11. Senate moves to nonconcurrency with House on 5/25/11.

New York

Year: 2010
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Other funding mechanisms
Citation: SO 8481

Bill Information: <http://assembly.state.ny.us/leg/?bn=S08481&term=2009>

Summary: Establishes the New York state infrastructure development bank within the banking department, makes a \$250,000,000 appropriation. Sunsets in 15 years. (Last Update: 2/25/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Senate Finance Committee on 9/8/10.

Year: 2011
Status: Pending
Topics: Other funding mechanisms
Citation: AB 5795

Bill Information: <http://assembly.state.ny.us/leg/?bn=A05795&term=2011>

Summary: Establishes the New York state infrastructure development bank within the banking department. Makes a \$250,000,000 appropriation. Would expire in 15 years. (Last Update: 4/6/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to Assembly Banks Committee on 3/1/11.

Year: 2011
Status: Pending
Topics: Motor Fuel Tax
Citation: AB 1496

Bill Information: <http://assembly.state.ny.us/leg/?bn=A01496&term=2011>

Summary: Reduces the tax on petroleum businesses and sets the sales and compensating use taxes on the retail sales of motor fuel and diesel motor fuel at four cents a gallon instead of eight cents per gallon. (Last Update: 5/23/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Assembly Ways and Means Committee on 1/10/11.

Ohio

Year: 2011
Status: Enacted

Topics: Design-build | Public private partnerships

Citation: HB 114

Bill Information: http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/BillText129/129_HB_114_PH_N.html

Summary: Authorizes ODOT to enter into public-private partnerships (P3s) based on solicited and unsolicited proposals from private entities relating to transportation facilities. Establishes the procedures for selecting a proposal and the terms of an agreement, including grounds for terminating an agreement. A P3 may cover any aspect of a transportation facility, from development, to construction, to operation of the facility. In regard to funding for a transportation facility controlled by a P3, the bill authorizes private contributions, any available public funds, user fees, and State Infrastructure Bank obligations. The bill grants ODOT rule-making authority to carry out the purposes related to P3s. Sets forth procedures for accepted solicited and unsolicited proposals and terms that must be in the concession agreement. Makes permanent the authority granted to the Department of Transportation to enter into design-build agreements. Limits the agreement to a two year, for which appropriations have been made by the general assembly to the DOT. Nevertheless, any agreement may be renewed for succeeding two-year periods when the general assembly enacts sufficient appropriations to the DOT for each successive biennium. (Last Update: 4/4/2011)

Bill History: Introduced in the House on 2/22/11. Passed out of the House on 3/10/11. Introduced in the Senate on 3/15/11. Amended in committee on 3/23/11. Passed the Senate on 3/23/11. House concurs on 3/23/11. Signed by the Governor on 3/30/11. Effective 4/6/11.

Oregon

Year: 2011

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Vehicle Miles Tax

Citation: HB 2328

Bill Information: <http://gov.oregonlive.com/bill/2011/HB2328/>

Summary: Requires persons operating electric motor vehicles and plug-in hybrid electric motor vehicles to pay vehicle road usage charge. Permits person paying vehicle road usage charge to apply for refund of motor vehicle fuel tax. Directs the DOT to establish methods for reporting vehicle miles traveled. Provides penalty for violation of laws and making false statements related to payment and reporting of vehicle road usage charge or for collecting, attempting to collect or receiving refund to which person is not entitled. Punishes by maximum fine of \$720. Directs department to suspend driving privileges of person who fails to pay vehicle road usage charge or related penalties. Creates offense of tampering with vehicle metering system. Punishes by maximum fine of \$720. Permits person to seek refund for miles driven on private property. Modifies definition of 'transportation project' to allow department to enter into agreements under Oregon Innovative Partnerships Program for collection of vehicle road usage charge. (Last Update: 7/8/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 1/10/11. Referred to Transportation and Economic Development with subsequent referral to Revenue on 1/21/11. Passed out of Committee on 4/8/11 and

referred to the House Revenue Committee. Passed out of Committee and referred to the House Ways and Means Committee on 5/17/11. Died - session ended.

Year: 2011
Status: Pending
Topics: Other funding mechanisms
Citation: HB 2545

Bill Information: <http://gov.oregonlive.com/bill/2011/HB2545/>

Summary: Establishes tax on motor vehicle rentals; deposits revenue to State Highway Fund; continuously appropriates moneys to Department of Transportation for highway purposes; applies to motor vehicles rented on or after January 1, 2012. (Last Update: 4/6/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 1/11/11. Referred to the House Committee on Transportation and Economic Development on 1/21/11.

Year: 2011
Status: Pending
Topics: Other funding mechanisms
Citation: SB 260

Bill Information: <http://gov.oregonlive.com/bill/2011/SB260/>

Summary: Authorizes issuance of lottery bonds for transportation projects; establishes Local Government Transportation Improvement Fund for purpose of funding local government transportation projects; continuously appropriates moneys in fund to Department of Transportation; directs Land Conservation and Development Commission to consider certain criteria when preparing, adopting and amending goals and guidelines that relate to this state's transportation system. (Last Update: 4/6/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 1/10/11. Referred to the Senate Committee on Business, Transportation and Economic Development on 1/18/11.

Pennsylvania

Year: 2010
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Public private partnerships
Citation: HB 9a

Bill Information: <http://www.legis.state.pa.us/cfdocs/billinfo/billinfo.cfm?year=2009&ind=1&body=H&type=B&N=0009>

Summary: Would establish public private transportation partnerships. Requires the private entity that wants to either build or operate a facility to obtain written approval from the

responsible public entity and the affected public entity or written approval from the responsible public entity and deemed approval from the affected public entity (specifies what has to be in the proposal seeking approval). The public entity has to make the following comments on the proposal: whether the proposed qualifying transportation facility will address the needs of Pennsylvania, regional or local transportation by improving safety, reducing congestion, abating environmental pollution, advancing energy efficiency or conservation, improving homeland security, increasing capacity or enhancing economic efficiency. If the public entity does not comment within 45 days it shall be deemed to have approved the proposal. Creates a procedure for independently submitted requests for proposals. Defines confidential and proprietary information. Specifies the powers and duties of the private entity. Specifies the provisions of the interim and comprehensive agreements. Species the procedure if the private entity goes into default. (Last Update: 2/18/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the House Transportation Committee on 9/16/10.

Year: 2011
Status: Enacted
Topics: Transit funding
Citation: HB 986

Bill Information:

<http://www.legis.state.pa.us/cfdocs/billinfo/billinfo.cfm?year=2011&ind=0&body=H&type=B&N=0986>

Summary: Apportions proceeds from the sale of lottery tickets to free or reduced fares transit service for the elderly. (Last Update: 7/12/2011)

Bill History: Introduced in the House on 3/9/11. Passed the House on 4/13/11. Introduced in the Senate on 4/13/11. Passed the Senate on 6/24/11. Signed by the Governor on 6/30/11.

Year: 2011
Status: Pending
Topics: Public private partnerships
Citation: HB 3

Bill Information:

<http://www.legis.state.pa.us/cfdocs/billinfo/billinfo.cfm?year=2011&ind=0&body=H&type=B&N=0003>

Summary: Would establish public private transportation partnerships. Requires the private entity that wants to either build or operate a facility to obtain written approval from the responsible public entity and the affected public entity or written approval from the responsible public entity and deemed approval from the affected public entity (specifies what has to be in the proposal seeking approval). The public entity has to make the following comments on the proposal: whether the proposed qualifying transportation facility will address the needs of Pennsylvania, regional or local transportation by improving safety, reducing congestion, abating environmental pollution, advancing energy efficiency or conservation, improving homeland security, increasing capacity or enhancing economic efficiency. If the public entity does not comment within 45 days it shall be deemed to have approved the proposal. Creates a

procedure for independently submitted requests for proposals. Defines confidential and proprietary information. Specifies the powers and duties of the private entity. Specifies the provisions of the interim and comprehensive agreements. Species the procedure if the private entity goes into default. (Last Update: 3/4/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the House Transportation Committee on 2/14/11. Passed out of committee on 3/3/11.

Rhode Island

Year: 2010 Ballot Measure

The measure would allow the state to issue general obligation bonds to match federal funds to improve state highways, roads, and bridges. The amount would not be able to exceed \$80 million. Another \$4.7 million would be used to buy and improve buses for the Rhode Island Public Transit Authority's bus fleet.

Approved with 73% of the vote

Ballot information: <http://www.rilin.state.ri.us/billtext10/housetext10/article-005-sub-a-as-amended.htm>

Year: 2010

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Public private partnerships

Citation: SB 2132

Bill Information: <http://www.rhodeislandvotes.org/2010-SB-2132>

Summary: Would allow public-private partnerships (PPP) which are contractual agreements formed between a public agency and private sector entity that would allow for greater private sector participation in the delivery of transportation projects. This act would take effect upon passage. (Last Update: 2/25/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Housing and Municipal Government Committee on 2/4/10.

South Carolina

Year: 2011

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Public private partnerships

Citation: SB 103

Bill Information: http://www.scstatehouse.gov/php/web_bh10.php

Summary: Provides that the Department of Transportation may solicit proposals for public-private initiatives from private entities; provides for the proposal request and submission process; provides for the process of selecting a private entity to participate in a public-private

initiative; provides for interim and comprehensive agreements to carry out the terms of the public-private initiative. (Last Update: 6/2/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to Committee on Transportation on 1/11/11. Died - session ended.

South Dakota

Year: 2010

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Motor Fuel Tax | Other transportation fees | Registration fees

Citation: SB 1

Bill Information: <http://legis.state.sd.us/sessions/2010/Bill.aspx?Bill=1>

Summary: Increases certain registration fees and taxes for the use of motor vehicles on the public highways. Increases the age limit on vehicles from five to ten years for a reduction in license fees. Increases the motor fuel tax from \$0.22/gallon to \$0.27/gallon on May 1, 2010; increases the motor fuel tax from \$0.27/gallon to \$0.32/gallon on May 1, 2012. Increases the excise tax on motor fuel from three percent to three and one half percent. (Last Update: 2/3/2010)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Senate Transportation Committee on 1/12/10. Amended on 1/27/10. Deferred by committee on 2/1/10.

Year: 2011

Status: Enacted

Topics: Registration fees

Citation: HB 1192

Bill Information: <http://legis.state.sd.us/sessions/2011/Bill.aspx?Bill=1192>

Summary: Would raise vehicle registration fees in two stages. Registration fees would rise from \$42 to \$51 per year in 2011 then to \$60 in 2013. The bill would also raise registration fees for motor homes, travel trailers, and motorcycles. (Last Update: 3/16/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and read in House and referred to House Transportation on 1/27/11. Passed out of committee on 2/10/11. Passed the House and referred to the Senate on 2/16/11. Introduced and read in Senate and referred to Senate Transportation on 2/17/11. Passed out of committee on 2/25/11. Passed out of the Senate on 2/28/11. Delivered to the Governor on 3/3/11. Vetoed by the Governor on 3/10/11. Veto overridden on 3/11/11.

Texas

Year: 2011

Status: Enacted

Topics: Public private partnerships

Citation: SB 1048

Bill Information: <http://www.legis.state.tx.us/billlookup/history.aspx?legsess=82r&bill=sb1048>

Summary: Would allow concession agreements for public private partnerships for ferry, mass transit facility, vehicle parking facility or port facility (among others). Excludes financing, design, construction, maintenance, or operation of a highway in the state highway system. Identical to HB 2432. (Last Update: 7/5/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 3/1/11. Referred to Economic Development Committee on 3/16/11. Passed the Senate on 4/19/11. Introduced in the House on 4/20/11. Passed the House with amendments on 5/25/11. Senate concurred on 5/27/11. Sent to the Governor on 5/30/11. Signed by the Governor on 6/17/11.

Year: 2011

Status: Enacted

Topics: Public private partnerships | Tolling

Citation: SB 19

Bill Information: <http://www.legis.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=82R&Bill=SB19>

Summary: Establishes a process for toll project development. Creates a first right of refusal guarantee (or primacy) for local toll entities to build future toll projects. Also allows tolling entities to complete environmental and other pre-project development work more quickly with the goal of expediting the primacy determination process. Would allow regional authorities to enter into tolling agreements. (Last Update: 7/5/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 2/16/11. Referred to the Transportation and Homeland Security Committee on 2/17/11. Hearing on 3/16/11. Passed the Senate on 3/29/11. Introduced in the House on 3/30/11. Passed the House on 5/23/11. Sent to the Governor on 5/30/11. Signed by the Governor on 6/17/11.

Year: 2011

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Vehicle Miles Tax

Citation: HB 1669

Bill Information:

<http://www.legis.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=82R&Bill=HB1669>

Summary: Develops a pilot program to test the framework for collecting a VMT for electric vehicles. (Last Update: 6/2/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 2/23/11. Referred to the House Transportation Committee on 3/3/11. Passed out of committee on 4/27/11. Referred to Calendars on 5/10/11. Died - session ended.

Year: 2011
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Other funding mechanisms
Citation: SB 1395

Bill Information:

<http://www.legis.state.tx.us/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=82R&Bill=SB1395>

Summary: Would create a State Infrastructure Bank. Sets forth provisions for its administration and financing. (Last Update: 6/2/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 3/9/11. Referred to the Senate Homeland Security and Transportation Committee on 3/22/11. Died - session ended.

Utah

Year: 2011
Status: Enacted
Topics: Sales Tax
Citation: SB 229

Bill Information: <http://le.utah.gov/~2011/htmdoc/sbillhtm/sb0229.htm>

Summary: Shifts 30% of the growth in sales-tax revenue (based on Fiscal Year 2011) from the General Fund to the Centennial Highway Fund or the Transportation Investment Fund of 2005. The shift is about \$60 million per year beginning in FY 2013. (Last Update: 6/2/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 2/4/11. Passed the Senate on 3/2/11. Passed the House on 3/11/11. Governor vetoed on 3/30/11. Senate and House override Governor's veto on 5/6/11.

Year: 2011
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Motor Fuel Tax
Citation: SB 239

Bill Information: <http://le.utah.gov/~2011/htmdoc/sbillhtm/sb0239.htm>

Summary: Raises the gasoline tax \$0.75 cents every two years beginning in 2013. Would raise the liquefied natural gas tax \$0.10 per gallon. (Last Update: 3/30/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 2/4/11. Read and referred to the Senate Transportation Committee on 2/25/11. Passed out of committee on 3/1/11. Failed a Senate vote on 3/7/11.

Vermont

Year: 2010

Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Transportation appropriations
Citation: HB 784

Bill Information:

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/database/status/summary.cfm?Bill=H.0784&Session=2010>

Summary: Recommends \$596 million in transportation spending for FY 2011 (\$13.5 million provided from ARRA). Funds projects like a Burlington to Albany, New York rail line and the repair of bridges. (Last Update: 2/25/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 3/19/10. Referred to the House Appropriations Committee on 3/23/10. Passed out of committee and read a third time on 3/25/10. Passed the House on 3/26/10. Introduced in the Senate and referred to Committee on Transportation on 3/31/10. Reported favorably out of committee and referred to the Appropriations Committee on 4/16/10. Read a second time on 4/20/10. Passed amended and sent back to the House for concurrence on 4/21/10. House did not concur - conference committee appointed on 4/26/10. Passed by both the House and Senate as amended by the conference committee on 5/5/10.

Year: 2011
Status: Enacted
Topics: Transportation appropriations
Citation: HB 443

Bill Information:

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/database/status/summary.cfm?Bill=H.0443&Session=2012>

Summary: \$554 million package that includes funding for paving and bridge repair and flood disaster assistance. A little more than \$410 million of the transportation program will be invested directly in infrastructure projects, mostly in construction and related spending. (Last Update: 6/2/2011)

Bill History: Introduced on 3/29/11. Passed by the House on 3/31/11. Introduced in the Senate on 4/5/11. Passed by the Senate on 4/20/11. Signed by the Governor on 6/1/11.

Virginia

Year: 2011
Status: Enacted
Topics: Other funding mechanisms | Transit funding
Citation: HB 2527

Bill Information: <http://lis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?111+sum+HB2527>

Summary: Provides statewide transportation funding. The bill creates the Virginia Transportation Infrastructure Bank to fund transportation projects. Up to 20 percent of funds in the Bank may be used to make grants or interest rate subsidies to localities for transportation projects, and the remainder is used to make loans to private or public entities for transportation

projects. The bill establishes the Intercity Passenger Rail Operating and Capital Fund to be used by the Director of the Department of Rail and Public Transportation, with the approval of the Commonwealth Transportation Board, on projects that expand and improve intercity passenger rail service. (Last Update: 5/4/2011)

Bill History: Introduced in the House on 1/21/11. Passed out of the House and referred to the Senate on 2/4/11. Passed the Senate with amendments and referred back to the House on 2/17/11. House rejects changes and sends back to Senate on 2/21/11. Senate insists on changes on 2/23/11. Conference committee set up on 2/23/11. House approves on 2/27/11. Passes Senate on 2/27/11. Sent to Governor on 3/3/11. Signed by the Governor on 4/22/11.

Year: 2011

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Motor Fuel Tax | Other transportation fees | Sales Tax

Citation: HB 1892

Bill Information: <http://lis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?111+sum+HB1892>

Summary: Provides additional funding for transportation by (i) imposing a motor fuels sales tax rate of four percent, phased in over four years, for highway maintenance, (ii) increasing the state sales tax in Northern Virginia by 0.5 percent for transportation projects in Northern Virginia, and (iii) increasing the recordation tax in Northern Virginia at a rate of \$0.40 per \$100 valuation. The motor fuels tax is not effective until the unemployment rate in the Commonwealth decreases for four consecutive quarters after July 1, 2010. The bill requires the Department of Motor Vehicles, in consultation with the Virginia Port Authority and the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner, to develop a fee schedule for overweight vehicles, to be presented to the Joint Commission on Transportation Accountability by December 15, 2011. (Last Update: 2/17/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the House Finance Committee on 1/11/11. Left in Committee on 2/8/11.

Year: 2011

Status: Not Enacted

Topics: Sales Tax

Citation: SB 1242

Bill Information: <http://lis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?111+sum+SB1242>

Summary: Creates additional sources of revenue for transportation by increasing the motor vehicle sales and use tax by one-half percent and the motor vehicle rental tax by one percent and by imposing a five percent tax on the wholesale price of gasoline. The new revenue sources will be directed to the Rail Enhancement Fund, the Transportation Trust Fund, and the Highway Maintenance and Operating Fund for transportation projects and needs of the Commonwealth and to certain priority transportation projects, as designated by the Commonwealth Transportation Board, in Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads. The bill would also eliminate the one-half percent sales tax on food currently going to the Transportation Trust Fund and would raise the allowed credit for low-income taxpayers. (Last Update: 2/17/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Senate Finance Committee on 1/12/11. Left in committee on 2/8/11.

West Virginia

Year: 2011
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Other funding mechanisms
Citation: SB 395

Bill Information:

http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill_Status/Bills_history.cfm?input=395&year=2011&sessiontype=RS&btype=bill

Summary: Would direct excess funds from the Revenue Shortfall Reserve Fund to the State Road Fund if at the end of the fiscal year, the Revenue Shortfall Reserve Fund is funded at an amount equal to or exceeding ten percent of the state's General Revenue Fund budget for the fiscal year just ended. (Last Update: 6/2/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred to the Senate Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on 2/2/11. Passed out of committee and referred to the Senate Finance Committee on 2/11/11. Died - session ended.

Wyoming

Year: 2011
Status: Not Enacted
Topics: Motor Fuel Tax
Citation: HB 22

Bill Information: <http://legisweb.state.wy.us/2011/Titles/HB0022.htm>

Summary: Would increase the gas tax to 24 cents over the next three years. (Last Update: 2/18/2011)

Bill History: Introduced and referred the Transportation Committee on 1/11/11. Passed out of committee on 1/19/11. Failed a House vote on 2/2/11.