## Fiscal Estimate - 2003 Session

| Original   | Updated   | Corrected                                   | Supplemental                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| LRB Number <b>03-2446/2</b>  | Intr  | oduction Number                             | AB-499                         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subject  |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Historic buildings and downtown development  |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fiscal Effect  |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| State:  No State Fiscal Effect Indeterminate Increase Existing Appropriations Decrease Existing Appropriations Create New Appropriation  Local:  No Local Government Costs | Increase Existin<br>Revenues<br>Decrease Existi<br>Revenues | Increase Co                                 | <u></u>                        |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indeterminate  1. Increase Costs Permissive Mandato  2. Decrease Costs Permissive Mandato  | 4. Decrease Rever   | andatory Towns  Counties                    | Units Affected  Village Cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fund Sources Affected GPR FED PRO  | PRS SEG   | Affected Ch. 20 A<br>SEGS Ch. 84 and Ch. 20 | · · ·                          |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agency/Prepared By   | Authorize   | d Signature                                 | Date                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OT/ Dennis Leong (608) 266-9910  |   |   |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Fiscal Estimate Narratives DOT 9/23/2003

| LRB Number <b>03-2446/2</b>                 | Introduction Number | AB-499 | Estimate Type | Original |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---------------------|--------|---------------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Subject                                     |                     |        |               |          |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Historic buildings and downtown development |                     |        |               |          |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### **Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate**

Downtown Development: Fiscal Impacts

#### Assumptions

1. This Bill requires DOT to consult with State Main Street communities and other certified downtowns recognized by the Department of Commerce when a highway improvement project will have an impact on the downtown area. DOT must give priority to retaining the on-street parking when a highway project widens the streets for through traffic in the downtown area.

(Assumption: The public outreach requirement for the DOT to contact communities impacted by construction of highway projects in the downtown area will not likely result in additional hours or costs on the District staff. As a matter of practice, District project managers and their contractors meet regularly with local officials and residents in advance of upcoming transportation projects. District staff help the local communities develop and provide alternative access to downtown businesses. Discussions and actions are taken to mitigate project impacts to the communities. Discussions and negotiations regarding the retention of on-street parking can be included in these pre-project District outreach meetings.)

2. This Bill requires DOT to pay for the resurfacing and rehabilitation of parking lanes when the Department is making improvements to the travel lanes for Main Street and certified communities under the Department of Commerce.

(Assumption: There are currently 24 out of 34 Main Street communities in the Department of Commerce program that have state highways passing through the central business districts. In the Department's Six-Year Highway Improvement Plan (2002-2007), it is estimated that 10 Main Street communities could have construction projects in the downtown area. The Department of Commerce estimated another six downtown business districts that might seek certification within the next 2-6 years. This certification process would qualify these six (or more) communities for parking lane resurfacing or reconstruction costs from DOT. The parking lanes associated with the boundaries of the main street business district along a state highway varies between 8-14 blocks in length.)

Fiscal impact analysis is based on the following two scenarios:

A. Assuming 10 Main Street communities and 6 additional certified business districts qualify for resurfacing and reconstruction for 8 blocks of parking lanes for years 2002-2007.

Resurfacing (asphalt) for 16 downtown districts @ 8 blocks per district = \$704,000

Reconstruct (asphalt) 16 downtown districts @ 8 blocks per district = \$985,600

Reconstruct (concrete) 16 downtown districts @ 8 blocks per district = \$1,267,200

B. Assuming 10 Main Street communities and 6 additional certified business districts qualify for resurfacing and reconstruction for 14 blocks of parking lanes for years 2002-2007.

Resurfacing (asphalt) for 16 downtown districts @ 14 blocks per district = \$1,078,000

Reconstruct (asphalt) 16 downtown districts @ 14 blocks per district = \$1,509,200

Reconstruct (concrete) 16 downtown districts @ 14 blocks per district = \$1,940,400

\*NOTE: Under current law, if a community wants parallel parking along the marked route of a State Trunk Highway within their municipal boundaries; the municipality must pay for the parking per State Statute 86.32 (4) and agree to maintain those parking lanes. Under this bill, DOT pays for parking lanes for the Main Street and certified business district status, but not for parking lanes on other connecting highways. A "connecting highway" is a marked route of a State Trunk Highway on a street or highway in a municipality designated as a connecting highway under State Statute 86.32(1).

3. If a major highway project involves construction of a bypass, the Bill requires the DOT to design and construct an active bypass for a community when the local governing body of a city, village, or town adopts a resolution requesting such an action. This does not, however, include any major highway project that is subject to a construction contract that is in effect on the effective date of this bill. "Active bypass" is defined in the Bill as a bypass of an existing highway that is designed and constructed so that access to the bypass requires motorists to exit the existing highway in order to travel on the bypass. DOT highway design engineers have recommended a type of directional intersection or interchange to safely accomplish the intent of an "active bypass".

(Assumptions: The design was based on the concept of a directional split, similar to the interchange in Tomah where I-90 and I-94 splits into two interstate highways. This scenario gives the drivers time to make a decision to merge into the lanes that would either take them into the community or choose the route that would bypass the community. This scenario may require more right-of-way in order to construct the additional lanes, transitional lanes, and additional signage needed to inform drivers well in advance of the directional split. In order to maintain driver expectancy and consistency, that is, keeping the through lanes on the left and lanes leaving the main roadway to the right, it would be necessary to construct three bridges or structures for the two active bypasses at each end of the bypassed community.

Directional Split or Major Fork at both ends of the community \$11,083.335 (includes three bridges to accommodate right exits from the main highway in order to address driver expectancy concerns)

Regular diamond interchanges at both ends of the community \$8,680,392

Cost difference between active and regular bypass interchanges \$ 2,402,943

It cost at least \$2.4 million more to construct an active bypass provided that no other improvement is considered under this scenario. It is possible that an active bypass may have additional interchanges to allow for additional access from the highway which add back the cost for interchanges. For the purposes of this analysis, the additional cost impact per year may be \$2.4 million per bypass community if the DOT would to construct one new active bypass per year.

#### Long-Range Fiscal Implications

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

The Bill authorizes the Department of Commerce to certify downtown business districts. Upon certification, these business districts will be qualified to receive DOT assistance to resurface and reconstruct parking lanes. The long-range fiscal implications are based upon how many of these business districts will become certified in the future. It is possible that every community where a highway project runs through the downtown business district will ask to be certified and thus qualify for parking lane improvements. This will likely add 2-3 times the number of communities that will be eligible for parking lane improvements in the next six-year highway improvement plan. Estimated impact for the next Six-Year Highway Improvement Plan (2008-2014) ranges between \$2-6 million

### Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2003 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

| ☑ Original                               |                                     | Jpdated                               |                          | Corrected   |                | Supplemental    |  |  |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|----------------|-----------------|--|--|
| LRB Number                               | 03-2446/2                           |                                       | Intro                    | duction Nun   | nber ,         | AB-499          |  |  |
| Subject                                  |                                     |                                       |                          |   |                |                 |  |  |
| Historic buildings a                     | and downtown de                     | evelopment                            |                          |   |                |                 |  |  |
| I. One-time Costs                        | or Revenue Im                       | pacts for S                           | tate and/or              | Local Governm   | nent (do       | not include in  |  |  |
| annualized fiscal                        | •                                   |                                       |                          |   |                |                 |  |  |
| \$2-6 million increase parking lanes and | sed costs to state                  | e over 6 year                         | ar program p             | period (average   | \$1 million    | per year) for   |  |  |
| II. Annualized Cos                       |                                     | /ear ioi iiic                         | design and               |   |                |                 |  |  |
| II. Alliludii26u 00.                     | 313.                                |                                       | +                        | Annualized Fiscal Impact on funds from Increased Costs Decreased Cost |                |                 |  |  |
| A. State Costs by                        | Category                            |                                       |                          | moreasea coste  | <u>'</u>       | Decreased Costs |  |  |
|  | s - Salaries and F                  | Fringes                               | T                        | \$  |                |                 |  |  |
| (FTE Position CI                         |                                     | Ŭ                                     | 1                        | · · ·   |                |                 |  |  |
| State Operations                         | State Operations - Other Costs      |                                       |                          | 3,400,000   | ,†             |                 |  |  |
| Local Assistance                         | e                                   |                                       |                          |   |                |                 |  |  |
| Aids to Individua                        | als or Organizatio                  | ons                                   |                          |   | 1              |                 |  |  |
| TOTAL State                              | Costs by Categ                      | jory                                  |                          | \$3,400,000   | , <del> </del> | \$              |  |  |
| B. State Costs by                        | Source of Fund                      | st                                    |                          |   |                |                 |  |  |
| GPR                                      |                                     |                                       |                          |   | 1              |                 |  |  |
| FED                                      |                                     |                                       |                          | 2,720,000   | ,              |                 |  |  |
| PRO/PRS                                  |                                     |                                       |                          | 680,000   |                | -               |  |  |
| SEG/SEG-S                                |                                     |                                       |                          |   |                |                 |  |  |
| III. State Revenue revenues (e.g., tax   | s - Complete th<br>x increase, deci | is only whe                           | n proposa<br>ense fee, e | l will increase o   | or decrea      | se state        |  |  |
|  |                                     |                                       |                          | Increased Rev   | ,              | Decreased Rev   |  |  |
| GPR Taxes                                |                                     |                                       |                          | \$  |                | \$              |  |  |
| GPR Earned                               |                                     |                                       |                          |   |                |                 |  |  |
| FED                                      |                                     |                                       |                          |   |                |                 |  |  |
| PRO/PRS                                  |                                     |                                       |                          |   |                |                 |  |  |
| SEG/SEG-S                                |                                     |                                       |                          |   |                |                 |  |  |
| TOTAL State                              |                                     |                                       |                          | \$  |                | \$              |  |  |
|  | NE                                  | T ANNUAL                              | IZED FISCA               |   | <del></del>    |                 |  |  |
| NET CLANCE IN                            |                                     |                                       |                          | State   |                | <u>Local</u>    |  |  |
| NET CHANGE IN COSTS                      |                                     |                                       | \$3,400,000              | <u> </u>  | \$-200,000     |                 |  |  |
| NET CHANGE IN F                          | REVENUE                             | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |                          | \$  |                | \$              |  |  |
| Agency/Prepared                          | Ву                                  | A                                     | Authorized               | Signature   |                | Date            |  |  |
| DOT/ Dennis Leong (608) 266-9910         |                                     |                                       |                          |   | 9/22/2003      |                 |  |  |