



U. S. Department of Transportation
Maritime Administration

July 2007

U.S. Public Port Development Expenditure Report (FYs 2005 & 2006-2010)





Cover photographs courtesy of (clockwise from top left): the Port of Long Beach, CA; Port New Orleans, LA (lower left too); Port of Morehead City, NC.

U.S. Public Port Development Expenditure Report (FYs 2005 & 2006-2010)

July 2007

U.S. Department of Transportation
Maritime Administration
Office of Intermodal System Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
LIST OF TABLES	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FOR U.S. PUBLIC PORT DEVELOPMENT	3
Capital Expenditures – 2005.....	3
Capital Expenditures – By Expenditure Category	4
Capital Expenditures – New Construction vs. Modernization/Rehabilitation	6
Projected Capital Expenditures – 2006 - 2010.....	8
Capital Expenditures – By Expenditure Category	8
METHODS OF FINANCING CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	11
APPENDIX A – Historical Data on Capital Expenditures and Funding Sources	A-1
Capital Expenditures – 2001 - 2005	A-1
Funding Sources – 2001 - 2005	A-2
APPENDIX B – AAPA Survey Respondents	B-1
APPENDIX C – Blank AAPA Port Expenditure Surveys (FYs 2005 & 2006-2010)	C-1

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures for 1946–2005	3
Table 2	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Expenditure Category for 2005.....	5
Table 3	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Specialized General Cargo Facility for 2005 (Container & RO-RO/Auto)	5
Table 4	U.S. Public Port Capital Infrastructure Expenditures for 2005 (On-Terminal & Off-Terminal)	6
Table 5	U.S. Public Port Capital Dredging Expenditures for 2005 (Improvement vs. Maintenance).....	6
Table 6	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Expenditure and Facility for 2005 (New Construction & Modernization/Rehabilitation)	7
Table 7	U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures for 2006–2010.....	8
Table 8	U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures by Expenditure Category for 2006–2010	9
Table 9	U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures by Type of Specialized General Cargo Facility for 2006–2010 (Container & RO-RO/Auto)	10
Table 10	U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Infrastructure Expenditures for 2006–2010 (On-Terminal & Off-Terminal).....	10
Table 11	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Financing Method for 2005.....	11
Table 12	U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures by Type of Financing Method for 2006–2010	12
Table A1	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures for 2001–2005	A-1
Table A2	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Financing Method for 2001–2005	A-2

INTRODUCTION

This report is the result of a cooperative effort between the Maritime Administration (MARAD) and the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA). It was prepared by MARAD, using expenditure information furnished by AAPA. The survey data were obtained by AAPA from its U.S. corporate membership – public port agencies – which represent virtually all the major U.S. deep-draft coastal and Great Lakes ports. Public port agencies own approximately one-third of the U.S. deep-draft marine terminal facilities.

It is the only report of its kind in the port industry that covers capital expenditures at U.S. ports. Continuing a tradition first begun by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey in 1956, MARAD has been publishing this report since 1991. **For the first time, the survey captures security and container facility investments.**

This report includes fiscal year (FY) 2005 and projected five-year 2006-2010 expenditure data, along with the funding sources used to finance those expenditures. It aggregates data by geographical region, type of facility, on- and off-terminal infrastructure, dredging, security, and by new construction and modernization/rehabilitation.

It is important to note two characteristics about the data in this report – (1) they represent fiscal year (FY) data, and (2) ports have different fiscal years. (A fiscal year is defined as a 12-month period used to calculate annual financial reports. For example, a fiscal year ending June 30 extends from July 1 of one year to June 30 of the following year.) The table below shows the different fiscal years for the ports responding to the survey.

Fiscal Year (12 months ending...)	Port
March 31	Duluth
April 30	South Louisiana
June 30	Massachusetts (Boston), Wilmington (DE), Richmond (VA), Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, New Orleans, Port Lavaca/Point Comfort, St. Bernard, Coos Bay, Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco
July 31	Port Arthur
September 30	Palm Beach, Port Everglades, Freeport, Orange (TX), Tampa, Long Beach
December 31	New York/New Jersey, Houston, Greater Lafourche, Lake Charles, Indiana, Anchorage, Bellingham, Everett, Grays Harbor

A special appreciation is extended to the 32 ports that returned the FY 2005 survey. This report's response rate is 38 percent (32 respondents out of 85 AAPA U.S. members), which is much lower than recent response rates: 55 percent (for the last [FY 2003] report) and 62 percent (the average response rate for the last three reports [FYs 2001 – 2003]). (Response rates for earlier reports could not be calculated due to lack of information.) To put this report's response rate in context, the 32 respondents in FY 2005 represented –

- 18 out of the top 30 U.S. container ports in 2005
- 12 out of the top 30 U.S. ports in 2005 handling foreign and domestic waterborne cargo

Thanks also are extended to the 32 ports who submitted FY 2004 data. Their expenditures are included in historical tables and are broken out separately in Appendix A.

The report is available electronically at www.marad.dot.gov/Publications/ports.htm. For further information, contact the Maritime Administration; Office of Intermodal System Development; 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE (#W21-201, MAR-540); Washington, DC 20590; phone: 202-366-7678; fax: 202-366-6988; or email: ports.marad@dot.gov.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FOR U.S. PUBLIC PORT DEVELOPMENT

From 1946 through 2005, \$30.1 billion in capital improvements to port facilities and related infrastructure were reported by U.S. public port industry survey respondents. Table 1 summarizes the historical expenditures by coastal region. The investments made over the five years (2001-2005) account for 27 percent of historical expenditures. These investments cover expenditures for the construction of new facilities and the modernization and rehabilitation of existing ones. During this 60-year period, the South Pacific region accounted for one-third (35.0%). The top three regions (South Pacific, North Atlantic, and Gulf) together accounted for over 70 percent of historical expenditures.

Table 1[†]
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures for 1946 – 2005
 (Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Expenditures	Percent
North Atlantic	\$5,286,070	17.6%
South Atlantic	\$4,395,511	14.6%
Gulf	\$5,091,827	16.9%
South Pacific	\$10,543,806	35.0%
North Pacific	\$3,050,614	10.1%
Great Lakes	\$581,420	1.9%
Non-contiguous*	\$939,835	3.1%
Guam, Saipan	\$193,242	0.6%
Total	\$30,082,324	100.0%

[†] Total does not add up due to rounding.

* Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, & Virgin Islands.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES – 2005

This section discusses the U.S. public port capital expenditures for FY 2005. The public port industry's annual capital expenditures as reported by the 32 respondents (out of 85 AAPA U.S. members) exceeded the one billion-dollar mark for the tenth year. The 2005 expenditures totaled \$2.1 billion. This level of investment reflects the public port industry's efforts to address the increasing demands being placed on waterborne transportation through improvements to their marine terminal facilities and related land and waterside connections, as well as meeting today's need for enhanced port security. Appendix B contains a list of the 32 ports that responded to the 2005 expenditure survey.

Capital Expenditures – By Expenditure Category

Table 2 provides a breakdown of capital expenditures by expenditure category. Definitions of types of expenditure categories follow. Readers are invited to refer to the FY 2005 survey instrument itself in Appendix C.

- Each cargo facility type (general cargo, specialized general cargo, dry and liquid bulk, and passenger) includes expenditures for pier or wharf structures, handling equipment and open and closed storage facilities.
- “Specialized general cargo” includes container, roll-on/roll-off (RO-RO), and auto facilities.
- “Other” includes structures, land, and fixtures not directly related to the movement of cargo, such as maintenance and administrative facilities.
- “Infrastructure” expenditures cover improvements, such as roadways, rail, pipeline and utilities that are located on- or off-terminal property. The key distinction between on-terminal versus off-terminal is whether the expenditure was on port-owned property (i.e., on-terminal).
- “Dredging” consists of local port expenditures associated with the deepening and/or maintenance of federal and non-federal channels, connecting channels, and berths, as well as local costs for land, easements, rights-of-way, disposal areas, and mitigation.
- “Security” includes federal and local share expenditures for all security-related capital expenditure projects (e.g., fencing, access controls, lighting, surveillance, etc.). Operational expenses are not included.

As shown in Table 2, specialized general cargo facilities (which include container and RO-RO/auto facilities) were the leading expenditure category, both overall and among the six facility types, accounting for over half (\$1.0 billion or 51.2%) of 2005 capital investments.

For the first time ever, this report breaks out specialized general cargo facilities into two components: container and RO-RO/auto facilities. Table 3 shows the breakout and supports the importance of containerization in the port industry and to the nation. Nearly all specialized general cargo expenditures in 2005 (99.4%) were spent on container facilities.

Table 2^{†1}
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Expenditure Category for 2005
 (Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Type of Facility							Infrastructure		Dredging	Security	Total
	General Cargo	Specialized General Cargo	Dry Bulk	Liquid Bulk	Passenger	Other*	On-Terminal	Off-Terminal				
North Atlantic	\$12,226	\$95,430	-	-	\$2,693	\$4,177	\$87,457	\$3,786	\$21,069	\$7,524	\$234,363	
South Atlantic	7,875	179,171	404	359	5,697	5,374	3,609	3,330	23,103	20,919	249,840	
Gulf	67,141	44,321	5,665	426	20,245	71,983	16,556	7,015	13,559	21,188	268,098	
South Pacific	896	704,526	358	1,264	137,723	78,695	41,013	177,888	92,288	6,006	1,240,658	
North Pacific	951	12,487	-	-	160	15,312	74	566	4	301	29,854	
Total	\$89,089	\$1,035,935	\$6,427	\$2,049	\$166,518	\$175,541	\$148,708	\$192,585	\$150,023	\$55,938	\$2,022,813	
Percent	4.4%	51.2%	0.3%	0.1%	8.2%	8.7%	7.4%	9.5%	7.4%	2.8%	100.0%	

† Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* Respondent ports included the following expenses under "Other" – buildings (administrative, maintenance, etc.), facilities, equipment and machinery, land, parking, industrial park, marina, maintenance, fire boats, electrical/fire/heating systems, air conditioning, engineering services, computer upgrades, office renovation, terminal development, water line improvements, bridges, vehicles, boat launch, environmental, and recreation. A number of ports did not define "other" at all.

Table 3
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Specialized General Cargo Facility for 2005
 (Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Specialized General Cargo		Total	Percent
	Container	RO-RO/Auto		
North Atlantic	\$95,420	\$10	\$95,430	9.2%
South Atlantic	178,791	380	179,171	17.3%
Gulf	38,544	5,777	44,321	4.3%
South Pacific	704,445	81	704,526	68.0%
North Pacific	12,487	-	12,487	1.2%
Total	\$1,029,687	\$6,248	\$1,035,935	100.0%
Percent	99.4%	0.6%	100.0%	

¹ Table 2 excludes \$36,260,000 in expenditures from two regions (Great Lakes and Non-contiguous) that had fewer than three responses each.

Table 4^{‡2}
U.S. Public Port Capital Infrastructure Expenditures for 2005
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	On-Terminal				Off-Terminal				Total
	Road	Rail	Utilities	Other*	Road	Rail	Utilities	Other**	
North Atlantic	\$45	\$79,741	\$7,663	\$8	\$3,786	-	-	-	\$91,243
South Atlantic	143	2,422	782	262	3,330	-	-	-	6,939
Gulf	2,630	1,739	5,554	6,633	493	2,920	3,304	298	23,571
South Pacific	156	8,218	49	32,590	134,056	1,706	36,026	6,100	218,901
North Pacific	-	-	-	74	566	-	-	-	640
Total	\$2,974	\$92,119	\$14,049	\$39,566	\$142,231	\$4,626	\$39,330	\$6,398	\$341,293
Percent	2.0%	61.9%	9.4%	26.6%	73.9%	2.4%	20.4%	3.3%	
	44%				56%				100%

[‡] Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* On-terminal "other" was defined by survey respondents as storm water, people mover, bridges, trucks, jet array system, and engineering/design. Several ports did not define "other" at all.

** Off-terminal "other" was defined by survey respondents as barge unloader. A number of ports did not define "other" at all.

Table 5[‡]
U.S. Public Port Capital Dredging Expenditures for 2005
Improvement vs. Maintenance
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Improvement	Maintenance	Total	Percent
North Atlantic	\$20,862	\$206	\$21,069	14.0%
South Atlantic	15,765	7,339	23,103	15.4%
Gulf	6,340	7,219	13,559	9.0%
South Pacific	90,896	1,392	92,288	61.5%
North Pacific	-	4	4	0.0%
Total	\$133,863	\$16,160	\$150,023	100.0%
Percent	89.2%	10.8%	100.0%	

[‡] Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Capital Expenditures – New Construction vs. Modernization/Rehabilitation

Table 6 summarizes 2005 capital expenditures in two ways – by new construction and by modernization/rehabilitation (mod/rehab). For 2005, expenditures on new construction and mod/rehab were roughly equivalent (53.2% vs. 46.8%, respectively). Container facilities were the biggest expenditure category for both new construction and mod/rehab.

² Table 4 excludes \$33,658,000 in expenditures from two regions (Great Lakes and Non-contiguous) that had fewer than three responses each.

Table 6^{† 3}
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Expenditure and Facility for 2005
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	NEW CONSTRUCTION													Total
	Type of Facility					Infrastructure			Dredging			Security		
	General Cargo	Special. Gen'l Cargo Container	Special. Gen'l Cargo RO-RO/ Auto	Dry Bulk	Liquid Bulk	Passenger	Other	On-Terminal	Off-Terminal	Improvement	Maint.			
North Atlantic	\$3,383	\$50	-	-	-	\$864	\$2,738	\$79,272	-	-	\$20,862	-	\$7,499	\$114,669
South Atlantic	2,216	159,063	-	-	-	2,841	2,556	262	2,730	341	-	-	20,439	190,449
Gulf	36,087	36,800	5,695	5,640	426	19,811	63,214	13,332	3,218	6,331	335	335	21,188	212,077
South Pacific	-	265,999	81	-	-	14,625	72,913	1,353	82,355	90,896	-	-	5,603	533,826
North Pacific	163	12,487	-	-	-	-	11,661	74	566	-	-	-	181	25,132
Total	\$41,850	\$474,399	\$5,775	\$5,640	\$426	\$38,141	\$153,082	\$94,293	\$88,869	\$118,431	\$335	\$335	\$54,910	\$1,076,152
Percent	3.9%	44.1%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	3.5%	14.2%	8.8%	8.3%	11.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	

Region	MODERNIZATION / REHABILITATION													Total
	Type of Facility					Infrastructure			Dredging			Security		
	General Cargo	Special. Gen'l Cargo Container	Special. Gen'l Cargo RO-RO/ Auto	Dry Bulk	Liquid Bulk	Passenger	Other	On-Terminal	Off-Terminal	Improvement	Maint.			
North Atlantic	\$8,843	\$95,370	\$10	-	-	\$1,830	\$1,439	\$8,185	\$3,786	-	\$206	-	\$25	\$119,694
South Atlantic	5,658	19,728	380	404	359	2,855	2,817	3,347	600	15,423	7,339	480	480	59,391
Gulf	31,053	1,744	82	25	-	434	8,769	3,224	3,796	9	6,884	-	-	56,021
South Pacific	896	438,446	-	358	1,264	123,098	5,783	39,660	95,533	-	1,392	403	403	706,832
North Pacific	788	-	-	-	-	160	3,651	-	-	-	4	120	120	4,723
Total	\$47,239	\$555,288	\$472	\$787	\$1,623	\$128,376	\$22,459	\$54,416	\$103,715	\$15,432	\$15,825	\$1,028	\$1,028	\$946,661
Percent	5.0%	58.7%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	13.6%	2.4%	5.7%	11.0%	1.6%	1.7%	0.1%	0.1%	

† Totals may not add up due to rounding.

³ Table 6 excludes \$36,260,000 in expenditures from two regions (Great Lakes and Non-contiguous) that had fewer than three responses each.

PROJECTED CAPITAL EXPENDITURES – 2006-2010

The 2005 AAPA capital expenditure survey asked for projected expenditures for FYs 2006-2010. Table 7 summarizes reported expenditures by coastal region. During this five-year period, public port expenditures are projected to reach \$8.6 billion. Appendix B contains a list of the 19 survey respondents (out of 85 AAPA U.S. members).

Of the eight regions below, half predict expenditures greater than \$1 billion (South Pacific with over \$3 billion, the South Atlantic with more than \$2 billion, and the North Atlantic and Gulf each over \$1 billion). Three regions (North Pacific, Great Lakes, and Non-contiguous) estimate expenditures under \$1 billion, which is due in large part to their low response rates. The last region (Guam, Saipan) had no respondents.

Table 7
U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures for 2006-2010
 (Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Expenditures	Percent
North Atlantic	\$1,152,506	14.0%
South Atlantic	2,326,164	28.3%
Gulf	1,010,791	12.3%
South Pacific	3,625,683	44.1%
North Pacific	97,682	1.2%
Great Lakes	21,531	0.3%
Non-contiguous*	343,600	4.0%
Guam, Saipan	-	0.0%
Total	\$8,577,957	100.0%

* Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, & Virgin Islands

Capital Expenditures – By Expenditure Category

Table 8 shows projected future expenditures by expenditure category. At 46.9 percent, ports expect to invest heavily in specialized general cargo facilities (which include container and RO-RO/auto facilities) with projected expenditures of \$3.9 billion. This is similar to the respondents' experience in 2005, which is found in Table 2.

Table 8⁴
U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures by Expenditure Category for 2006-2010
 (Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Type of Facility										Dredging	Security	Total
	General Cargo	Specialized General Cargo	Dry Bulk	Liquid Bulk	Passenger	Other*	On-Terminal	Off-Terminal	Dredging	Security			
North Atlantic	\$153,055	\$249,782	-	-	-	\$650	\$277,468	-	\$427,116	\$44,435	\$1,152,506		
South Atlantic	308,054	920,052	775	60,326	173,259	405,009	133,382	3,704	289,751	31,852	2,326,164		
Gulf	190,343	367,758	-	-	41,179	221,358	64,499	16,751	94,983	13,921	1,010,791		
South Pacific	-	2,279,978	4,920	108,732	141,398	621,780	160,566	162,671	78,774	66,864	3,625,683		
Total	\$651,452	\$3,817,570	\$5,695	\$169,058	\$355,836	\$1,248,797	\$635,915	\$183,126	\$890,624	\$157,072	\$8,115,144		
Percent	8.0%	47.0%	0.1%	2.1%	4.4%	15.4%	7.8%	2.3%	11.0%	1.9%			

[†] Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* "Other" was defined by FY 2006-2010 survey respondents as information technology (IT), buildings, water distribution system, groundwater cleanup, machinery/equipment, labor/overhead, consulting, land, administration & maintenance, ILA break rooms, customer facilities, new terminal development, industrial park, marina, bridges, fireboats, environmental, recreational, cruise terminal, technology, and port expansion. A few ports did not define "other" at all.

⁴ Table 8 excludes \$462,813,000 in expenditures from three regions (North Pacific, Great Lakes, and Non-contiguous) that had fewer than three responses each.

Table 9 breaks out specialized general cargo facility projected investments by facility type: container versus RO-RO/auto. Similar to Table 3 (which shows 2005 data), nearly all (99.2%) responding ports show a distinct preference for container facilities.

Table 9⁵
U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures by Type of
Specialized General Cargo Facility for 2006-2010
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Container	RO-RO/Auto	Total	Percent
North Atlantic	\$246,831	\$2,951	\$249,782	6.5%
South Atlantic	918,802	1,250	920,052	23.9%
Gulf	339,557	28,201	367,758	9.5%
South Pacific	2,279,952	26	2,279,978	59.1%
Total	\$3,785,142	\$32,428	\$3,817,570	100.0%
Percent	99.2%	0.8%	100.0%	

Table 10 examines the five-year projected infrastructure investments. It breaks down on- and off-terminal infrastructure investments into four subcategories – road, rail, utilities, and “other.”

Table 10^{† 5}
U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Infrastructure Expenditures for 2006-2010
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	On-Terminal				Off-Terminal				Total
	Road	Rail	Utilities	Other*	Road	Rail	Utilities	Other**	
North Atlantic	\$100	\$276,933	\$285	\$150	-	-	-	-	\$277,468
South Atlantic	46,298	70,529	3,881	12,674	-	3,704	-	-	137,086
Gulf	20,971	15	16,840	26,674	15,421	520	-	810	81,250
South Pacific	30,586	27,195	67,928	34,857	141,204	948	3,994	16,525	323,237
Total	\$97,955	\$374,672	\$88,934	\$74,355	\$156,625	\$5,172	\$3,994	\$17,335	\$819,041
Percent	15.4%	58.9%	14.0%	11.7%	85.5%	2.8%	2.2%	9.5%	

† Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* On-terminal “other” was defined as chassis maintenance building, core sampling, terminal entrances, bridge, and R&M. A number of ports did not define “other” at all.

** None of the survey respondents defined off-terminal “other.”

⁵ Tables 9 and 10 exclude \$37,322,000 and \$18,875,000, respectively, in expenditures from three regions (North Pacific, Great Lakes, and Non-contiguous) that had fewer than three responses each.

METHODS OF FINANCING CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

The 2005/2006-2010 AAPA expenditure survey respondents (32 out of 85 AAPA U.S. members) also provided information on the methods they used to finance their capital investments. They used six funding categories to classify the financing methods: port revenues, general obligation bonds (GO bonds), revenue bonds, loans, grants, and "other." Funding category definitions follow.

- "Port Revenues" are income generated by the port through its operations.
- "General Obligation (or GO) Bonds" are issued by a state, city, or local government. They are secured by the taxing and borrowing power of the issuing jurisdiction, rather than the revenue from a given project.
- "Revenue Bonds" are issued by a state, city, or local government to finance public works projects. Bond principal and interest are secured by the revenues of a given project.
- "Loans" are money that an entity owes a lender. They can be short or long term, based on when they will be paid off. This financial transaction is provided at a cost, referred to as interest on the debt.
- A "grant" is a contribution of cash by one government entity (or other organization) to another. Many times these contributions are made to local governments from state and federal governments. Grants are used to support a public purpose and do not have to be repaid.
- "Other" includes all financing sources that were not described above, such as state transportation trust funds, state and local appropriations, and taxes (property, sales). The specifics of what is included in this category are footnoted in Tables 11 and 12.

Table 11^{† 6}
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Financing Method for 2005
 (Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Facility Expenditures by Financing Method												Total
	Port Revenues	Pct.	GO Bonds	Pct.	Revenue Bonds	Pct.	Loans	Pct.	Grants	Pct.	Other*	Pct.	
North Atlantic	\$544	0.0%	\$220,096	63.1%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	\$1,804	2.6%	\$3,189	4.6%	\$225,633
South Atlantic	74,944	5.3%	35,486	10.2%	98,000	90.8%	2,776	42.9%	20,098	29.0%	18,537	26.5%	249,840
Gulf	101,184	7.2%	84,736	24.3%	9,980	9.2%	3,694	57.1%	34,958	50.5%	33,546	48.0%	268,098
South Pacific	1,225,157	86.8%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	12,194	17.6%	3,306	4.7%	1,240,658
North Pacific	9,744	0.7%	8,378	2.4%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	156	0.2%	11,296	16.2%	29,575
Total	\$1,411,574	100.0%	\$348,696	100.0%	\$107,979	100.0%	\$6,470	100.0%	\$69,211	100.0%	\$69,874	100.0%	\$2,013,803
Percent	70.1%		17.3%		5.4%		0.3%		3.4%		3.5%		100.0%

[†] Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* "Other" was defined as state, grants, CPF, priority transportation, federal, joint venture, private funding, DOTD, CIP, cash reserves, and Army Corps of Engineers. A few respondents did not define "other" at all.

⁶ Table 11 excludes a total of \$45,269,000 in 2005 funding sources [\$9,009,000 for which there was no information on funding source, and \$36,260,000 from two regions (Great Lakes and Non-contiguous) that had fewer than three responses each].

Table 12⁷
U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures by Type of Financing Method for 2006-2010
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Facility Expenditures by Financing Method												Total
	Port Revenues	Pct.	GO Bonds	Pct.	Revenue Bonds	Pct.	Loans	Pct.	Grants	Pct.	Other*	Pct.	
N. Atlantic	\$6,034	0.1%	\$1,032,547	72.0%	–	0.0%	\$4,000	24.1%	\$109,925	49.1%	–	0.0%	\$1,152,506
S. Atlantic	616,151	14.2%	196,654	13.7%	927,872	68.9%	12,622	75.9%	13,290	5.9%	559,575	72.7%	2,326,164
Gulf	667,082	15.4%	204,643	14.3%	43,233	3.2%	–	0.0%	35,931	16.0%	59,902	7.8%	1,010,791
S. Pacific	3,035,898	70.2%	–	0.0%	375,000	27.9%	–	0.0%	64,785	28.9%	150,000	19.5%	3,625,683
Total	\$4,325,165	100.0%	\$1,433,844	100.0%	\$1,346,105	100.0%	\$16,622	100.0%	\$223,931	100.0%	\$769,477	100.0%	\$8,115,144
Percent	53.3%		17.7%		16.6%		0.2%		2.8%		9.5%		100.0%

† Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* "Other" was defined as state appropriations, (state) Department of Commerce, CPF, federal, joint venture, tenant reimbursement, CIP, settlement proceeds, and sale proceeds. One respondent indicated the source was under review.

⁷ Table 12 excludes \$462,813,000 in 2006-2010 funding sources from three regions (North Pacific, Great Lakes, and Non-contiguous) that had fewer than three responses each).

Appendix A – Historical Data on Capital Expenditures and Funding Sources

Capital Expenditures – 2001-2005

Table A1 shows the annual expenditures from 2001 to 2005 broken down by region. No attempt is made to analyze this time series data, as the number and composition of ports responding each year differed, thus rendering analysis impossible.

Table A1[‡]
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures for 2001-2005
 (Thousands of Dollars)

Region	2001		2002		2003		2004		2005	
	Expenditure	No. of Surveys Rec'd	Expenditure	No. of Surveys Rec'd	Expenditure	No. of Surveys Rec'd	Expenditure	No. of Surveys Rec'd	Expenditure	No. of Surveys Rec'd
North Atlantic	\$176,315	6	\$336,223	8	\$385,284	6	\$279,490	4	\$234,363	4
South Atlantic	220,027	7	159,834	7	304,651	8	221,054	6	249,840	6
Gulf	169,823	17	252,550	22	237,185	15	159,448	11	268,098	11
South Pacific	981,534	7	836,683	8	531,010	8	298,418	4	1,240,658	4
North Pacific	117,967	10	78,776	8	222,839	8	7,255	4	29,854	4
Great Lakes	1,000	2	310	2	2,980	1	7,925	2	5,960	2
Non-contiguous*	73,468	4	4,792	3	-		10,700	1	30,300	1
Guam, Saipan	-		-		-		-		-	
Total	\$1,740,134	53	\$1,669,168	58	\$1,683,946	46	\$984,290	32	\$2,059,073	32
AAPA U.S. Members		87		84		84		85		85
Response Rate (%)		61%		69%		55%		38%		38%
3-Year Avg. Resp. Rate (2001-2003)				62%						

[‡] Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, & Virgin Islands.

Funding Sources – 2001-2005

Table A2 provides an historical summary of financing methods used from 2001-2005. No attempt is made to analyze this time series data, as the number and composition of ports responding each year differed, thus rendering analysis impossible.

Table A2^{† 8}
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Financing Method for 2001-2005
 (Thousands of Dollars)

Method	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Port Revenues	\$802,331	\$547,040	\$751,044	\$299,667	\$1,422,016
GO Bonds	96,478	334,372	206,051	345,837	348,696
Revenue Bonds	449,088	188,120	223,557	183,794	107,979
Loans	12,401	60,281	45,429	8,467	7,306
Grants	94,453	110,047	100,005	72,909	94,191
Other	119,005	187,076	191,299	56,304	69,874
Total	\$1,573,756	\$1,426,936	\$1,517,385	\$966,978	\$2,050,063
No. of Surveys Rec'd	53	58	46	32	32
AAPA U.S. Members	87	84	84	85	85
Response Rate (%)	61%	69%	55%	38%	38%
3-Year Average Resp. Rate (2001-2003)	62%				

[†] Totals may not add up due to rounding.

⁸ Table A2 excludes the following expenditures for which there was no information on funding source:
 2001 - \$166,378,000 2002 - \$242,232,000 2003 - \$166,561,000 2004 - \$17,312,000
 2005 - \$9,009,000.

Appendix B – AAPA Survey Respondents⁹

Respondent	2005 Survey	2006 – 2010 Survey
North Atlantic		
Albany Port District Commission	–	–
Diamond State Port Corp. (Wilmington, DE)	X	X
Maryland Port Administration (Baltimore)	–	–
Massachusetts Port Authority (Boston)	X	–
Philadelphia Regional Port Authority	–	–
Port of Richmond (VA)	X	X
South Jersey Port Corporation	–	–
The Port Authority of New York & New Jersey	X	X
South Atlantic		
Canaveral Port Authority	–	–
Georgia Ports Authority	X	X
Jacksonville Port Authority	–	–
North Carolina State Ports Authority	X	X
Port Everglades Port Authority	X	X
Port of Miami	–	–
Port of Palm Beach	X	–
South Carolina State Ports Authority	X	X
Virginia Port Authority	X	X
Gulf		
Alabama State Port Authority	–	–
Greater Baton Rouge Port Commission	–	–
Greater Lafourche Port Commission	X	X
Lake Charles Harbor and Terminal District	X	–
Mississippi State Port Authority at Gulfport	–	–
Panama City Port Authority	–	–
Plaquemines Port Authority	–	–
Port Manatee	–	–
Port of Beaumont	–	–
Port of Brownsville	–	–
Port of Corpus Christi Authority	–	–
Port of Freeport	X	–
Port of Galveston	–	–
Port of Houston Authority	X	X
Port of New Orleans	X	X
Port of Orange	X	–
Port of Pascagoula	–	–
Port of Pensacola	–	–
Port of Port Arthur	X	X
Port of Port Lavaca / Point Comfort	X	–
Port of South Louisiana	X	–
St. Bernard Port, Harbor & Terminal District	X	–
Tampa Port Authority	X	–

⁹ A dash (–) indicates survey not returned.

Respondent	2005 Survey	2006 – 2010 Survey
South Pacific		
Port of Hueneme/Oxnard Harbor District	–	–
Port of Humboldt Bay	–	–
Port of Long Beach	X	X
Port of Los Angeles	X	X
Port of Oakland	–	–
Port of Redwood City	–	–
Port of Sacramento	–	–
Port of Stockton	–	–
San Diego Unified Port District	X	X
San Francisco	X	–
North Pacific		
Port of Bellingham	X	X
Port of Coos Bay	X	–
Port of Everett	X	X
Port of Grays Harbor	X	–
Port of Kalama	–	–
Port of Longview	–	–
Port of Olympia	–	–
Port of Portland (OR)	–	–
Port of Seattle	–	–
Port of Tacoma	–	–
Port of Vancouver (USA)	–	–
Great Lakes		
Cleveland-Cuyahoga County Port Authority	–	–
Detroit/Wayne County Port Authority	–	–
Duluth Seaway Port Authority	X	–
Indiana Port Commission	X	X
Port of Chicago	–	–
Port of Green Bay	–	–
Port of Milwaukee	–	–
Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority	–	–
Non-Contiguous		
Anchorage	X	X
Commonwealth Port Authority of Saipan	–	–
Hawaii DOT	–	–
Port Authority of Guam	–	–
Port of Ponce, PR	–	–
Puerto Rico Ports Authority	–	–
Virgin Islands Port Authority	–	–

AAPA PORT EXPENDITURE SURVEY – FY 2005

For the fiscal year ended: _____, 2005

Port Name: _____ Date: _____

Prepared by: _____ Title: _____

Phone: _____ Email: _____

FACILITY TYPE		NEW CONSTRUCTION (Actual US\$)	MODERNIZATION/ REHABILITATION (Actual US\$)	TOTAL EXPENDITURES (Actual US\$)
General Cargo ¹		.00	.00	0.00
Specialized General Cargo ¹ :				
	Container ONLY	.00	.00	0.00
	RO/RO, auto, etc.			0.00
Dry Bulk Cargo ¹				0.00
Liquid Bulk Cargo ¹				0.00
Passenger or Cruise ¹				0.00
Infrastructure Improvements ²				
On-Terminal	Highway	.00	.00	0.00
	Rail			0.00
	Utilities			0.00
	Other ()			0.00
Off-Terminal	Highway			0.00
	Rail			0.00
	Utilities			0.00
	Other ()			0.00
Dredging	Improvement ³			0.00
	Maintenance ⁴			0.00
Security ⁵				0.00
Other ⁶	(Specify:)			0.00
	(Specify:)			0.00
	(Specify:)			0.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES (FY 2005) (must equal Total Funding Sources)		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

0.00

0.00

FUNDING SOURCES FOR FY 2005 EXPENDITURES		DOLLAR AMOUNT (Actual US\$)
Internal Revenues (Earned Income)		.00
General Obligation (G.O.) Bonds		.00
Revenue Bonds		.00
Loans	(Source:)	.00
Grants	(Source:)	.00
Other	(Source:)	.00
	(Source:)	.00
TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES (FY 2005) (must equal Total Expenditures)		\$0.00

0.00

0.00

Notes:

General – For each category listed under Facility Type, show the total amount expended and the amounts associated with new construction and/or modernization/rehabilitation.

- Includes expenditures for piers, wharves, handling equipment, and open and closed storage facilities.
- "Infrastructure Improvements" include expenditures for road, rail, pipeline, and utility improvements. The key distinction between on-terminal vs. off-terminal is whether the expenditure was on port-owned property (i.e., on-terminal).
- "Improvement" includes local costs for both federal and connecting channels, berths, disposal sites, and mitigation.
- "Maintenance" includes local costs for connecting channels, berths, disposal sites, and mitigation.
- "Security" includes federal & local share expenditures for all security-related capital expenditure projects (e.g., fencing, CCTV, access controls, lighting, command & control, etc.). Operational expenses not included.
- "Other" includes expenditures for any structures, land, and fixtures not related to cargo movement, such as maintenance or administrative facilities.

AAPA PORT EXPENDITURE SURVEY – Projections for FYs 2006-2010

Port Name: _____ Date: _____

Prepared by: _____ Title: _____

Phone: _____ Email: _____

FACILITY TYPE	TOTAL EXPENDITURES (Actual US\$)
General Cargo ¹	.00
Specialized General Cargo ¹ :	
Container ONLY	.00
RO/RO, auto, etc.	
Dry Bulk Cargo	
Liquid Bulk Cargo ¹	
Passenger or Cruise ¹	
Infrastructure Improvements ² :	
Highway	.00
Rail	
Utilities	
Other ()	
Highway	
Rail	
Utilities	
Other ()	
Dredging ³	
Security ⁴	
(Specify:)	
(Specify:)	
(Specify:)	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES (FYs 2006-2010) (must equal Total Funding Sources)	\$0.00

0.00

FUNDING SOURCES FOR FYs 2006-2010 EXPENDITURES	DOLLAR AMOUNT (Actual US\$)
Internal Revenues (Earned Income)	.00
General Obligation (G.O.) Bonds	.00
Revenue Bonds	.00
Loans (Source:)	.00
Grants (Source:)	.00
Other (Source:)	.00
Other (Source:)	.00
TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES (FYs 2006-2010) (must equal Total Expenditures)	\$0.00

0.00

0.00

Notes:

General – For each category listed under Facility Type, show the total amount expended and the amounts associated with new construction and/or modernization/rehabilitation.

1. Includes expenditures for piers, wharves, handling equipment, and open and closed storage facilities.
2. "Infrastructure Improvements" include expenditures for road, rail, pipeline, and utility improvements. The key distinction between on-terminal vs. off-terminal is whether the expenditure was on port-owned property (i.e., on-).
3. "Dredging" includes local costs (maintenance and improvement dredging) for both federal and connecting channels, berths, disposal sites, and mitigation.
4. "Security" includes federal & local share expenditures for all security-related capital expenditure projects (e.g., fencing, CCTV, access controls, lighting, command & control, etc.). Operational expenses not included.
5. "Other" includes expenditures for any structures, land, and fixtures not related to cargo movement, such as maintenance or administrative facilities.



U.S. Maritime Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue
Washington, DC 20590