



## Focus Funding Survey

**Gloria M. Shepherd**

**PIARC Sustainable Development and Road  
Transport, Technical Committee 2.1.2**

**Technical Committee Member**

**Email: [gloria.shepherd@dot.gov](mailto:gloria.shepherd@dot.gov)**





# Introduction

- ❖ The goals and purpose of the survey:
  - 1) Identify how Member countries work to get closer to the implementation of sustainability.
  - 2) Examine how Member countries prioritize environmental mitigation.



## Introduction (Cont'd)

- 3) Assess how different transportation agencies predict the funding implications of environmental and social outcomes.
- 4) Analyze the outcomes of effective methodologies for predicting future funding levels/needs in respect of environmental and social outcomes.



## Introduction (Cont'd)

- 5) Develop a definition of mitigation
- 6) Examine effectiveness of mitigation activities



## Introduction (Cont'd)

- Survey developed to address specific funding issues:
  - 1) environmental consideration
  - 2) forecasting vs. actual cost
  - 3) shifting resources
  - 4) reprioritizing projects
  - 5) compromising objectives



## Barriers, Funding and Budgets

- **United States (U.S.)–**
  - a) Balance is maintained between meeting the purpose and need for the project and mitigation of adverse impacts

## Barriers, Funding and Budgets (Cont'd)

- b) Meet mobility needs while minimizing the impacts of the project to the human and natural environment
- **U.S., Norway, New Zealand, Denmark, Japan-**
  - a) Guided by legislation and policies

## Barriers, Funding and Budgets (Cont'd)

b) Mitigation is a viable linkage to efficient transportation plans

- **United Kingdom**

a) no linkage between plans and projects

b) Mitigation frequently seen as a bandage



## Barriers, Funding and Budgets (Cont'd)

- **Finland, Pakistan, South Africa-**
  - a) critical when certain issues/actions take place or are needed (i.e. safety improvements, groundwater protection structures)



## Full Assessment Against Objectives

- Encompass a number of considerations (ecological, economic, cultural, aesthetic)
- Commonality identified--full assessment against safety, environment, and economic development objectives

## Full Assessment Against Objectives (Cont'd)

- **United States**
  - a) plans developed as well as goals/objectives identified
  - b) projects developed as part of the plan and are consistent with the goals/objectives
  - c) National Environmental Policy Act

## Full Assessment Against Objectives (Cont'd)

- **Other participating countries (Finland, Norway, United Kingdom)**
  - a) full range of assessment against wide range of objectives
  - b) objectives limited by financial and political uncertainties



## Program Objectives Translated into Projects

- Set priorities for project implementation
- Purpose and Need statement for projects is consistent with planning and program objectives
- Legislation guides how environmental and social impacts address funding gaps

## Program Objectives Translated into Projects (Cont'd)

- Explore savings in areas that deliver against poorly defined objectives
- Social and environmental studies/objectives/requirements budgeted and provided for during planning and design phase



## Program Objectives Translated into Projects (Cont'd)

- Environmental considerations translated into projects
- Environmental issues balanced against other items

# Cost vs. Revenues

- Actual cost significantly higher than revenues—various actions taken:
  1. change or reduce scope
  2. phase construction
  3. change priorities
  4. shift resources



## Cost vs. Revenues (Cont'd)

5. Government serve as the regulatory entity and controls the costs
  6. Seek public/private partnerships
- Financial plan for transportation plans and programs detailing revenues and costs

# Acceptance of a Mitigation Culture

- Benefits of a mitigation culture
- Various approaches to a mitigation culture—
  - a) conduct environmental process more closely with the planning process
  - b) systematic environmental assessment follow up process

## Acceptance of a Mitigation Culture (Cont'd)

- c) depends on importance of the environmental/social impact or involvement of legal obligations
- d) rely on early identification of mitigation issues
- e) acceptance as a forethought

## Acceptance of a Mitigation Culture (Cont'd)

- f) expectations for acceptance and acknowledges it exist
- g) no acceptance for a mitigation culture
- h) acknowledges mitigation as a logical option, but not a culture



# Maintaining Plans and Programs

- **France and United Kingdom**
  - a) project sponsors consulted
  - b) selective in the weight attached to environmental polices

## Maintaining Plans and Programs (Cont'd)

- **New Zealand**
  - a) project sponsors give added prominence to other objectives (i.e. economic, safety)
  - b) environmental and social objectives—secondary considerations

# Maintaining Plans and Programs (Cont'd)

- **France**
  - a) consults with project sponsors to determine the effectiveness of the transport plans, programs, and financial documents

## Maintaining Plans and Programs (Cont'd)

- **U.S., Norway, Denmark, South Africa**
  - a) regulations/guidelines satisfy specific compliancy and sustainability criteria (i.e. U.S. federal regulations require a certification review process and air quality conformity determinations)



## Maintaining Plans and Programs (Cont'd)

- **South Africa**
  - a) Select options that satisfies all compliancy and sustainability criteria
- **Pakistan**
  - a) Develops strategies to feed information into a monitoring program

# Maintaining Plans and Programs (Cont'd)

- **Japan**

- a) Conducts assessments that examine new measures and future budget request

- **Finland**

- a) Maintained only if there are rigorously applicable tools



# Conclusions

- Participating countries must integrate environmental and social considerations into their decision-making processes and activities.
- Sustainable development requires a change of mindset.



## Conclusions (Cont'd)

- Large scale mitigation and enhancement projects have proven positive results and a valued effort.
- Several challenges to facilitate a widespread use of environmental mitigation.



## Conclusions (Cont'd)

- Funding and budgeting should be considered early in the planning process.
- Later the mitigation considered, the greater the cost may become.

## Conclusions (Cont'd)

- **Follow-up actions—**
  1. financial analysis
  2. integrating mitigation into program level funding
  3. routine assessment or review process

## Conclusions (Cont'd)

4. develop regulations and/or incentives to keep environmental and other mitigating factors as priorities in projects



## Conclusions (Cont'd)

5. conducting the planning and environmental processes more closely to create seamless decision-making