Port Planning and Investment Toolkit (PPIT)

- Cooperative agreement between AAPA and MARAD
- Develop PPIT to help ports with developing “investment-grade” project plans to attract public and private investment
Port Planning and Investment Toolkit (PPIT)

PPIT is envisioned to inform and guide:

- Developing capital plans that clearly identify future needs;
- Determining the most cost-effective, sustainable and efficient solutions to port challenges;
- Positioning port projects for federal funding such as TIGER grants; and
- Getting port infrastructure projects into MPO and state transportation programs to qualify for other government funding;
- Obtaining private sector funding to support their infrastructure projects.
PPIT Working Groups

Initial Pool of Volunteers
- Led by:
  - Jean Godwin – AAPA
  - Lauren Brand – MARAD
  - Stephen Shafer - MARAD
- 64 Port Staff & Consultant Volunteers
- Port Staff, Consultants, PPMs and PPM Candidates

Table of Contents Working Group
- 14 Volunteers
- Multiple areas of expertise

Funding Module Working Group
- 16 Volunteers
- Primarily finance and accounting experts

Planning & Feasibility Modules Working Group
- 9 Volunteers
- Primarily marketing, engineering/planning and economic experts
Previously Completed Module 3: Funding

- Module 3: Funding was the first PPIT tool component prepared
- Completed in October 2014 by The PFM Group
- Analytical Tools, Guidance and Project Profiles on strategies and best practices for funding and financing major port capital improvements

It is important for a port and its advisors to be involved in the process of developing and reviewing these projections/reports with an emphasis on credit standards in order to ensure that access to financial markets and partners is achievable for the project.

The feasibility screening tasks outlined in Exhibit 3.2 are overlapping and iterative as capital cost, demand & revenue, and operating & maintenance assumptions as well as market conditions inevitably change. The output from this feasibility assessment can be used to determine if a port should proceed with the project as planned, modify the project requirements to meet market demand and cost limitations, or to discontinue the project altogether.

3.3. Risk Analysis

The port and other project team members should develop and evaluate risk factors that could impact the viability of the project. Key inputs to the development of the financing options will be the results of the demand & revenue forecasts, operations & maintenance cost estimates and construction cost/implementation schedules to test and refine alternative financing strategies.

- Define project financing risks and evaluation criteria/measures in order to craft and assess the impact to financial scenarios
- Use risk adjusted demand & revenue forecasts, operations & maintenance cost estimates and construction cost/implementation schedules to test and refine alternative financing strategies
- Identify stress points in the project to assess cash flow due to sensitivity analysis
- Develop credit rating and investor risk mitigation strategies and incorporate the same into the plan of finance
- Identify a short list of mitigating financial strategies with key decision makers and project team members

For smaller capital improvement program financings that fit within a port's overall system financing structure, risk analysis may be limited if system net revenues are clearly sufficient to support additional debt service requirements. That is, the risk analysis may be limited to system wide strains on net revenues or an evaluation of how present day financing fits into the system plan of finance if future capital needs are on the horizon, all of which can be analyzed via a port system cash flow model approach. Alternatively for large project developments, all risk assessments and sensitivity scenarios should be evaluated primarily through a project finance model. Many infrastructure investors advocate Value for Money ("VfM") analysis to evaluate project risks, and VfM is used in USDOT major project financial plans. VfM “prices” risk by producing a discounted net present value amount that represents the aggregate impact of the various sensitivities. An assessment of VfM for P3 procurements is a comparative concept, and as such most delivery agencies seek to use a "public sector comparator" approach to evaluating VfM, as shown in Exhibit 3.3.
Approach for Toolkit Completion

Three step process:
1. Review/consider relevant examples
2. Develop Module 1
3. Develop Module 2
4. Integrate toolkit documents

Port Industry Working Group

Tasks:
- Project Initiation
- Working Group Coordination
- Planning/Feasibility Data Collection and Research
- Development of Planning Module 1
- Development of Feasibility Module 2
- Toolkit Document Consolidation
Module 1: Planning

- Setting Goals & Objectives
- Existing Conditions (infrastructure, equipment and capacity)
- Identifying Project Drivers (market analysis, cargo forecasts)
- Quantifying Needs/Requirements
- Planning Options
- Estimating Impacts and Costs (CapEx and OpEx)
- Define Recommended Project
- Evaluating Options (in parallel with Feasibility Assessment)
- Project Recommendation and Phasing
- Stakeholder Outreach
Module 2: Feasibility

- Business Strategy (asset development and revenue/cost schedules)
- Risk Assessment (register and mitigation strategy)
- Financial Performance (rate of return/NPV)
- Economic Impact (employment, benefit cost, local/state/national impacts)
### Appendices

- Project Profiles/Case Studies
- Toolkit Checklist
- Financial Model Sample
- Helpful Resources
  - Manuals and Guides
  - RFQs and Scopes of Service
- Strategic/Master Plans
- Feasibility Studies
- EIS/EIR Documents
- Glossary of Terms

### Table: Resource Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic/Master Plans</td>
<td>Compilation of Data and Recommendations for Port of Fort Pierce Master Plan Update</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation, District Four</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>St. Lucie County, Florida</td>
<td>Port-wide</td>
<td><a href="http://www.stlucieco.gov/pdfs/FtPierce-Sep2013_Final.pdf">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic/Master Plans</td>
<td>Jacksonville Port Authority: Strategic Master Plan</td>
<td>Martin Associates</td>
<td>Jacksonville Port Authority</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td>Port-wide</td>
<td><a href="http://www.jacksonport.com/sites/default/files/Port%20Authority%20Strategic%20Plan%202013-11.pdf">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic/Master Plans</td>
<td>Port of Longview Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Port of Longview</td>
<td>Port of Longview, Washington</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Port of Longview, Washington</td>
<td>Port-wide</td>
<td><a href="http://portoflongview.com/Port%20Documents/Strategic%20Plan%20FINAL%20ADOPTED%207-13-12.pdf">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQs and Scopes of Service</td>
<td>RFQ: Professional Consulting Services for Strategic Planning, Process and Strategic Business Plan Development</td>
<td>Oregon International Port of Coos Bay</td>
<td>Coos Bay, Oregon</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Coos Bay, Oregon</td>
<td>Port-wide</td>
<td><a href="http://www.polb.com/environment/docs.asp">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQs and Scopes of Service</td>
<td>Scope of Services for Port of Fort Pierce Master Plan</td>
<td>Joint Center</td>
<td>Port of Fort Pierce</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>St. Lucie County, Florida</td>
<td>Port-wide</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tiogagroup.com/docs/Tioga_Group-2001/2.%20Post-Master%20Plan%202001.pdf">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQs and Scopes of Service</td>
<td>Scope of Work 2014 Marine Hwy Feasibility Study for June 2015 to June 2016</td>
<td>USDA Rural Development</td>
<td>REAP Investment Fund, Inc.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota</td>
<td>Marine Highway Facility</td>
<td><a href="http://www.farmpolicy.com/infrastructure/planningportal.gov/infrastructure%20plan%20Chesapeake%202016%20Cruise%20Terminal%20(REAP%20Investment%20Fund%202015-16%20Final%201.5B%20EN%20(Final)%20Jan%202016).pdf">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Studies</td>
<td>Study to Determine the Feasibility of a Cruise Ship Berthing Facility</td>
<td>Ports &amp; Maritime Group, INT.</td>
<td>Catalina Island Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Avalon, California</td>
<td>Cruise Terminal</td>
<td><a href="http://www.catalinachamber.com/membership/membership%20info/cruise%20facility">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS/EIR Documents</td>
<td>Pier 5 Marine Terminal + Back Channel Improvements Project</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Port of Long Beach</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Long Beach, California</td>
<td>Multi-use Terminal</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pblb.com/environment/docs.asp">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS/EIR Documents</td>
<td>Eagle Rock Aggregate Terminal Project</td>
<td>Aspen Environmental Group</td>
<td>Port of Long Beach</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Long Beach, California</td>
<td>Dry Bulk Terminal</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pblb.com/environment/docs.asp">Link</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Port Planning and Investment Toolkit

## Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR TASKS</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 1: Project Mgmt. &amp; Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2: Project Initiation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 3: Working Group Coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 4: Data Collection and Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 5: Development of Planning Module 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 6: Development of Feasibility Module 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 7: Toolkit Document Consolidation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Draft Report

### Final Deliverable

- **Notice to Proceed**
- **CC/Webinar**
- **Milestone/Deliverable**
- **Working Group Coordination**
- **Working Group Review Period**

---

*WSP*  
*PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF*
March 2016 Update

- Update on Completed PPIT
- AAPA Infrastructure and Finance Seminar
  - San Diego, CA
  - March 9-10, 2016
  - Marriott – Gas Lamp Quarter