

Prioritizing Capital Needs for Public Ports

Cheryl Ball, JD
Freight and Waterways Administrator
MoDOT₁

Agenda

- ▶ Public Port Capital Investment Program
- ▶ Freight Enhancement Program – Multimodal
- ▶ Moving Forward

Public Port Capital Investment Program



2014 MoDOT-Led Process

Scoring Factor	Currently	Increase #	Increase %
Capacity Improvement (tons)			
Staging Improvement (trucks/rail)			
Docking Improvement (barges)			
Storage Improvement (sq. feet)			
Access (modal connection via rail or road)			
Land Acquisition (Acres)			
Job Creation			
Is this on the port's comprehensive plan? Yes/No			
Will this support an existing/committed or a prospective customer?			

2014 Analysis

Pros

- ▶ Experts Rating Projects
- ▶ Single Prioritized List
- ▶ Transparent Decisions
- ▶ MoDOT Facilitation
- ▶ Well-received by legislators

Cons

- ▶ Competitors ranking projects–Bias
- ▶ Subjective Focused
- ▶ Ports didn't own process
- ▶ Quantifying improvements challenging

2018 Port-Led Prioritization

Scoring Criteria	No	Yes
Moved freight in last fiscal year	10	Ferry & <1m = 5 >1m = 0
Unexpended CIP \$\$ in last 5 years?	2	-10
% local match - \$1m max project cost	0	20% (min) = 1 40% = 3 50% = 5
Const. \$\$ expended	0	port \$ = 2 state \$ = 5

Scoring Criteria	No	Yes
This phase generates \$\$ or stimulates commerce	-5	5
Private investment or new tonnage created	0	5
Committed or retained jobs?	0	Yes <50 = 5 Yes >50 = 10
PE expended on project	0	port \$ = 1 state \$ = 2 10

2018 Analysis

Pros

- ▶ Experts Rating Projects
- ▶ Single Prioritized List
- ▶ Semi-Transparent Decisions
- ▶ Qualitative

Cons

- ▶ Self- evaluation - QA/QC?
- ▶ No MoDOT role in list development
- ▶ Focus heavily on port not project
- ▶ Limited buy-in of results from ports
- ▶ “Spread \$\$ around”

Freight Enhancement Program



Points	Advances State Freight Plan	% match	Project Administration	Reduced Truck Freight	OSOW Reduction
5	Directly improves multiple performance metrics or implements more than one strategy actions listed in the freight plan	>50	FRE or other GR funded project experience; or Federal project experience	Committed reduction	Direct Reduction
4	Directly improves performance metrics or implements one of the strategy actions listed in the freight plan	41-50	LPA Program experience		
3	Directly advances one of strategies	31-40	MoDOT experience		
2	Indirectly advances strategy or performance metric	21-30			
1	Advances goals	20%	State, not MoDOT	Potential to reduce truck freight	indirect reduction
0	None		No state or LPA experience	None	None

Points	>1 mode impacted	# or % additional freight handled by improvement	Committed Customer	Job Creation related to regional existing jobs	New MO Freight?
5	>3 modes	>20%	Support Expansion of existing business or committed new business	Significant # jobs added	Yes, non-highway
4	3 modes	15-20%	Support more efficiency for existing business		
3	2 modes	8-15%	Identifiable prospective customer supported	Moderate # jobs added	Yes, but includes highway
2		4-8%			
1	1 mode	0-3%	Speculative Customer	minimal	
0		None		None	No

2018–2019 Analysis

Pros

- ▶ Predominately objective criteria
- ▶ Easily scored
- ▶ Aligned closer to SFP goals and measures
- ▶ Factors elevated good projects

Cons

- ▶ MoDOT staff only evaluating
- ▶ MoDOT staff developing criteria

Moving Forward



FY 2021 and Beyond

- ▶ Collaborate to Influence the Process
 - Adopt Portions of the FRE Process
 - Focus on Projects, not Sponsors
 - Focus on Complete Segments, not Unusable Pieces
 - Objective Criteria, not Subjective
- ▶ Retain Disincentive for Unused Funds
- ▶ Engage Ports in MPO/RPC Planning Process Directly
- ▶ Retain MPAA Recommendation; MHTC Final Authority

Thank You

Cheryl Ball, JD
Freight and Waterways Administrator
MoDOT
573.526.5578
Cheryl.Ball@MoDOT.MO.Gov