

# **State of Alaska FY2006 Governor's Operating Budget**

## **Department of Transportation/Public Facilities Planning Results Delivery Unit Budget Summary**

## Planning Results Delivery Unit

### Contribution to Department's Mission

Optimize state investment in transportation and meet federal requirements through effective planning and programming.

### Core Services

- Develop statewide and area transportation plans to guide transportation infrastructure development over the next 20 years and fulfill federal and state requirements.
- Coordinate the development, submission, and monitoring of the Needs List (a statewide list of transportation needs), and the federally required Statewide Transportation Improvement program, as well as the annual capital budget. Provide key analyses to the Commissioner on critical issues regarding capital funding for Alaska's transportation and public facility needs.
- Verify enplanement data used to determine the State's allocation of Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) funding, prepare airport master plans, and annually prepare the program for aviation improvements.
- Provide federally required highway data collection and analysis to state, federal and local agencies.
- Provide Geographic Information System (GIS) and Global Positioning System (GPS) data collection and analysis, as well as cartographic and other technical services. The result will be more accessible transportation data that can be displayed and analyzed in easy-to-understand ways.
- Develop and maintain the Statewide Transportation Plan, Public Involvement Plan, and Federal Transit Program.
- Provide administration of Scenic Byways Program, Federal Railroad Administration grants.
- Develop and maintain a bicycle and pedestrian plan.
- Provide administration of Urban Planning, and State Planning and Research Programs, as well as general accounting and administrative support.
- Develop and administer the State Highway Comprehensive Safety Program.
- Administer planning for resource and community access roads program

End Results	Strategies to Achieve Results
<p><b>A: Access optimal federal funds for highway construction projects.</b></p> <p><u>Target #1:</u> A federally reviewed STIP not less than 30 days prior to the federal fiscal year.  <u>Measure #1:</u> Number of days difference between the target date and STIP transmittal for federal approval.</p>	<p><b>A1: Streamline and improve federal-aid funding process.</b></p> <p><u>Target #1:</u> By June 30, 2005, promulgate modifications to regulations to reduce time needed to prepare a STIP.  <u>Measure #1:</u> The deviation in months to approve regulations that modify the STIP process (17 AAC 05).</p> <p><u>Target #2:</u> Decrease time needed to process project development authorizations (PDAs) and amendments by 10%.  <u>Measure #2:</u> The percent change in time between the date that a funding request is logged into the Management Reporting System to the date it is approved by FHWA.</p>
End Results	Strategies to Achieve Results
<p><b>B: Achieve measurable improvement in highway safety.</b></p> <p><u>Target #1:</u> A reduction in the number of fatal and major injury accidents of 1% per year over 5 years.  <u>Measure #1:</u> Number of persons with fatal injuries and major injuries accidents using a 3-year average period to</p>	<p><b>B1: Increase the public's awareness of safe driving habits.</b></p> <p><u>Target #1:</u> Improve voluntary seatbelt use by at least 4% as compared to the 5-year average.  <u>Measure #1:</u> Percent change in voluntary seatbelt usage as measured by the annual Alaska seatbelt use survey</p>

each subsequent 3-year average.

funded by NHTSA each year.

**B2: Emphasize safety in transportation decision making.**

Target #1: A federally reviewed Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

Measure #1: Undertake, prepare and complete a strategic highway safety plan, which follows AASHTO guidelines, within three federal fiscal years.

### Major Activities to Advance Strategies

- Target behavior issues: high-risk youth and young drivers, areas of traffic congestion, seatbelt use, aggressive driving, etc.
- Evaluate any lapses of federal funds, and identify the cause of such lapse. Compare as a percentage of all funds that are administered by the division
- Create electronic tracking tools to enable a community to follow the history of each project through the STIP process.
- Create an overall communication strategy and related tools to enable faster and more thorough communications of changes occurring in the STIP.
- Provide design/build contract for HAR (highway advisory radio) and VMS (variable message signs) to enhance driver awareness of critical conditions.
- Ensure public awareness of the travel information system to ensure drivers are advised of changing highway conditions.

### FY2006 Resources Allocated to Achieve Results

**FY2006 Results Delivery Unit Budget: \$6,747,700**

**Personnel:**

Full time	77
Part time	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>

### Performance Measure Detail

#### A: Result - Access optimal federal funds for highway construction projects.

**Target #1:** A federally reviewed STIP not less than 30 days prior to the federal fiscal year.

**Measure #1:** Number of days difference between the target date and STIP transmittal for federal approval.

#### STIP Review Timetable: Plan versus Actual

Year	Target Date	Actual Date		YTD
2004	Sept 1, 2003	November 1, 2003		61 days late
2006	Sept 1, 2006			
2008	Sept 1, 2008			

**Analysis of results and challenges:** An approved STIP is essential if the state is to have access to federal funds once each federal fiscal year begins. Each STIP has a 2 year valid life, thus the 2004 – 2006 STIP was nearly 32 days late, time which could have been used to continue project phases and eventually ensure that construction lettings are advertised in time for summer construction. The target of having the STIP ready for federal review at least 30 days prior to the federal fiscal year beginning provides a time cushion to deal with the time necessary for two federal agencies to conduct their reviews and issue letters of approval.

The above goal also ensures the Division and regional staff are progressing in the many steps it takes to deliver the STIP. Efforts continue to shave time on the STIP development cycle, a process which has grown unwieldy in recent years.

### A1: Strategy - Streamline and improve federal-aid funding process.

**Target #1:** By June 30, 2005, promulgate modifications to regulations to reduce time needed to prepare a STIP.

**Measure #1:** The deviation in months to approve regulations that modify the STIP process (17 AAC 05).

#### Timeline to Modify Regulation

Year	Target Date	Actual Date	YTD
2005	May 2005		

**Analysis of results and challenges:** This is a one-time measure that is critical to making a long-term change in how fast each STIP is prepared. The current STIP regulations call for three distinct public reviews, which along with several other required steps take more than two years to typically undertake. There are also other problems with the STIP development process, such as too much funding directed to lower classification roads, which jeopardizes higher classification roads which are of most important to the state's economic well-being. Changing these regulations is key to making meaningful change to the public process followed and in turn showing real accomplishment in making government more efficient.

Schedule to Modify STIP Regulations:  
 September 2004 - Initiate Regulation Change  
 November 2004 - Publish Draft Regulation  
 December 2004 - Hold Public Hearings  
 March 2005 - Release Final Regulations  
 May 2005 - Final Regulations Approved

**Target #2:** Decrease time needed to process project development authorizations (PDAs) and amendments by 10%.

**Measure #2:** The percent change in time between the date that a funding request is logged into the Management Reporting System to the date it is approved by FHWA.

#### Days Taken to Process Project Development Authorizations (FFY)

Year	YTD
2001	5.1
2002	5.6
2003	8.7
2004	

**Analysis of results and challenges:** Processing Project Development Authorization requests for Federal Highway Administration funding requires a lot of paper and use of the paper mail system. By eliminating some duplicate manual data entry processes, the funding requests processed can be reduced by 1 day. This will have a direct impact on how quickly construction projects can move ahead.

### B: Result - Achieve measurable improvement in highway safety.

**Target #1:** A reduction in the number of fatal and major injury accidents of 1% per year over 5 years.

**Measure #1:** Number of persons with fatal injuries and major injuries accidents using a 3-year average period to each subsequent 3-year average.

**Fatalities and Major Injuries from Accidents (3-year average)**

Year	Fatalities		Major Injury		YTD
2001	91	0	6,248	0	
2002	95	0	6,344	0	
2003	not available	0	not available	0	

**Analysis of results and challenges:** Fatal and major injury accidents are extremely costly to the individuals involved, and society as a whole. Medical costs, lost productivity, and the emotional loss are extensive. Society also incurs costs in the form of accident response, public contribution to medical costs and rehabilitation, and even the cost of congestion due to accidents on busy highways. The National Highway Safety Administration estimates the total costs of accidents in Alaska as more than \$400 million annually; the majority of these costs are the result of accidents involving major injuries and fatalities. Actual 2002 statistics were 89 traffic deaths and 6,370 non-fatal traffic injuries (the average increased because 1999 had much fewer deaths and injuries than the following years).

**B1: Strategy - Increase the public's awareness of safe driving habits.**

**Target #1:** Improve voluntary seatbelt use by at least 4% as compared to the 5-year average.

**Measure #1:** Percent change in voluntary seatbelt usage as measured by the annual Alaska seatbelt use survey funded by NHTSA each year.

**Seatbelt Use Rate**

Year	YTD
1998	57%
1999	60%
2000	61%
2001	63%
2002	66%
2003	79%
2004	77%

**Analysis of results and challenges:** The Alaska Highway Safety Office is required by federal rule to perform a standardized statewide occupant protection survey each year in order to measure the agency's progress toward eliminating motor vehicle injuries and fatalities.

The Alaska Highway Safety Office strives to prevent the loss of life, personal injury, and property damage caused by traffic crashes, and to reduce the resulting economic losses to the residents of Alaska through outreach programs and federally funded highway safety grant projects.

The agency coordinates highway safety programming focused on public education, enforcement, promotion of new safety technology, integration of public health strategies, collaboration with safety and private sector organizations, and cooperation with state and local governments.

**B2: Strategy - Emphasize safety in transportation decision making.**

**Target #1:** A federally reviewed Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

**Measure #1:** Undertake, prepare and complete a strategic highway safety plan, which follows AASHTO guidelines, within three federal fiscal years.

**Timeline to Complete Strategic Highway Safety Plan**

Year	Target Date		Actual Date		YTD
2006	June 2006				

**Analysis of results and challenges:** The US DOT, through several agencies (FHWA, NHTSA, FMCSA) is encouraging each state highway agency to develop a strategic highway safety plan that follows 22 emphasis areas. Such plans are cross-agency in nature, addressing opportunities to positively influence safety through

enforcement, design, driver behavior and other strategies. The Division of Program Development will spearhead this effort, but it will eventually involve participation from a wide variety of other internal and external components that also contribute to highway safety.

Completion of the plan by the end of SFY 2006 is based on the following schedule:

1. Host first safety planning meeting during 3rd quarter of SFY04 - achieved on schedule.
2. Establish multi-agency steering committee during 4th quarter of SFY04 - .
3. Select consult during 1st quarter of SFY05 - future goal.
4. Identify major target issues during 3rd quarter of SFY05 - future goal.
5. Draft Plan for public review during 2nd quarter of SFY06 - future goal.
6. Publish Final Plan during 4th quarter of SFY06 - future goal.

## Key RDU Challenges

Passage of the 1991 and 1998 Federal Transportation Bills, Federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA21), expanded the requirements to inform and involve the public in development of transportation plans and programs. As a result, the statewide and regional planning staff institute a greatly expanded public involvement program that includes holding multiple meetings throughout the region and other communications with local government and the general public. Planning staff then evaluate and rank all projects to identify the highest priority projects that are to compete statewide for federal highway funding. Reauthorization of TEA-21, did not occur prior to October 2004, but there are expectations that authorization will continue to increase funding for Alaska's federal highway and transit projects, and contain more complex requirements attached to the funding.

The Federal Aviation Administration has instituted a process called the Airport Capital Improvement Program which is designed to distribute Airport Improvement Program funds based upon priority and need. As part of the process, the regional planning staff must prepare a five-year aviation capital improvement program for each airport including the identification of planning, environmental, land and development needs. This activity requires the regional planning staff to conduct joint planning conferences at various airports throughout the region.

Two active lawsuits are challenging the manner by which transportation projects are evaluated and selected for funding. These two suits have the potential to significantly disrupt and make transportation planning more expensive. Currently, there is a significant body of both federal and state law and regulation that govern transportation planning and these various laws and regulations could be better synchronized to avoid conflicts and duplicative efforts.

The Division of Program Development will be completing work on a long-range transportation plan for Northwest Alaska and will start a plan for the interior as funding permits. These plans develop the 20-year transportation investment strategies for road, ferry, rail and air modes utilizing extensive local public involvement.

The Alaska Highway Safety Office identified major driver behavioral problem areas as the following categories: high-risk youth and young drivers; major urban areas with communities that have become recreational destinations; and the Municipality of Anchorage traffic congestion. Lack of child car seat and seatbelt usage continues to be an issue.

## Significant Changes in Results to be Delivered in FY2006

No changes in results delivered.

## Major RDU Accomplishments in 2004

- Prepared update to the Southeast Region and Southwest Transportation Plan.
- Prepared multiyear, federally required, Statewide Transportation Improvement Program for 2004 to 2006.
- Completed the development of regional transportation plan for Northwest Alaska.
- Increased seatbelt usage and traffic enforcement statewide through safety education programs.
- Completed placing in regulation the process of developing the Statewide Plan and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

- Completed proposal for Metropolitan Planning Organization and Metropolitan Planning Area at Fairbanks.

Contact Information
<p><b>Contact:</b> Jeff Ottesen, Director <b>Phone:</b> (907) 465-4070 <b>Fax:</b> (907) 465-6984 <b>E-mail:</b> Jeff_Ottesen@dot.state.ak.us</p>

**Planning  
RDU Financial Summary by Component**

*All dollars shown in thousands*

	FY2004 Actuals				FY2005 Management Plan				FY2006 Governor			
	General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	Total Funds	General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	Total Funds	General Funds	Federal Funds	Other Funds	Total Funds
<b>Formula Expenditures</b>												
None.												
<b>Non-Formula Expenditures</b>												
Program	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	84.4	0.0	3,106.4	3,190.8	85.3	0.0	3,219.7	3,305.0
Development												
Statewide	92.1	0.0	2,871.6	2,963.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Planning												
Central Region	112.7	0.0	1,228.7	1,341.4	101.0	0.0	1,333.6	1,434.6	103.0	0.0	1,387.7	1,490.7
Planning												
Northern Region	75.9	0.0	1,121.6	1,197.5	74.8	0.0	1,326.6	1,401.4	75.4	0.0	1,377.5	1,452.9
Planning												
Southeast Region	18.9	0.0	402.0	420.9	17.3	0.0	466.8	484.1	17.3	0.0	481.8	499.1
Planning												
<b>Totals</b>	<b>299.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>5,623.9</b>	<b>5,923.5</b>	<b>277.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>6,233.4</b>	<b>6,510.9</b>	<b>281.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>6,466.7</b>	<b>6,747.7</b>

**Planning**  
**Summary of RDU Budget Changes by Component**  
**From FY2005 Management Plan to FY2006 Governor**

*All dollars shown in thousands*

	<u>General Funds</u>	<u>Federal Funds</u>	<u>Other Funds</u>	<u>Total Funds</u>
<b>FY2005 Management Plan</b>	<b>277.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>6,233.4</b>	<b>6,510.9</b>
<b>Adjustments which will continue current level of service:</b>				
-Program Development	0.9	0.0	113.3	114.2
-Central Region Planning	2.0	0.0	54.1	56.1
-Northern Region Planning	0.6	0.0	50.9	51.5
-Southeast Region Planning	0.0	0.0	15.0	15.0
<b>FY2006 Governor</b>	<b>281.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>6,466.7</b>	<b>6,747.7</b>