Benefit Cost Analysis

FY 2017 TIGER Discretionary Grant Program

APPLICANT: Morgan City Harbor and Terminal District

PROJECT TITLE: Wharf Extension and Enhancement Project

In what may become the most transformative surface transportation investment in south central Louisiana in years, the Commissioners of the Morgan City Harbor and Terminal District (Port of Morgan City) are requesting funding from the FY 2017 TIGER Discretionary Grant Program for its "*Wharf Extension and Enhancement*" project. This is a capital works project at the Port of Morgan City's terminal facility located at 800 Youngs Road, Morgan City, Louisiana. This project will support the rehabilitation and renovation of the port's wharf by extending it 450 feet to the west and enhancing the dock area from its eastern extension over to the landside area, thus providing additional cargo-handling laydown area and a safer cargo transloading zone adjacent to docked vessels.

The Port's terminal facility is located on the northern bank of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) in Morgan City, Louisiana, slightly east of the GIWW's intersection with the Atchafalaya River. USCG statistics indicate that there are over 60,000 transits through this area annually. The port has a dock along the GIWW that has over 120,200 ft² of concreted area; however, the dock only has 800' linear feet along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. This is not sufficient space to berth multiple vessels simultaneously to transload cargo; and, this restricts the growth of business at the Port of Morgan City. This project intends to rectify that problem.

Baseline

The PMC site currently has a total of 28.6 acres with 22.49 acres located inside the U.S. Corps of Engineers' floodwall and 6.11 acres located between the floodwall and the GIWW. Over the years, the port received funding for infrastructure improvements through the state's "Ports' Priority Program." Since 1990, the port has been awarded \$9.75 million for eight projects. These projects have provided a dock (built in two phases); one 20,000 ft² warehouse; cargo-handling equipment; one active rail spur, and miscellaneous storage areas; but, due to the tremendous state budget deficient, future state funding is non-existent.

The wharf area at the port has approximately $80,000 \text{ ft}^2$ and is used exclusively for docking and transloading a vessel's cargo. With a dock length of 800 linear-feet, an authorized 20-ft draft channel and no pilot fees for shippers to pay to travel the Atchafalaya River and/or the GIWW, the port is the ideal location to handle small-to-medium-sized cargo vessels. Specific port cargo

handling equipment includes the following: three forklifts (an 8,000 lb; a 10,000 lb; and one 15,000 lb); a 35-ton cherry picker; and a 40-ton container handler.

Based on records from the port, annual maintenance for the dock totals approximately \$30,000 to \$35,000 per year. Most of this maintenance is related to utilities (i.e., electrical, water) and replacement (i.e., light fixtures, meters).

Over the last decade, business has been very slow at the dock. Repeated attempts by former port operators to draw business to the location failed; however, when a new executive director took over in September 2013, the port itself became the new "port operator" and began an aggressive effort to establish itself as a viable business option for shipping companies.

The port's location is a great and strategic asset. It is located on the northern bank of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway approximately 2,000 feet east of its intersection with the Atchafalaya River. The terminal site is located within the incorporated limits of Morgan City and is bisected by Youngs Road. The port has benefited from its central location in close-proximity to the Gulf of Mexico and several heavily traveled inland waterways. The port is well-served by surface transportation systems. For example, the site is located 1.1 mi from U.S. Highway 90, with the city of Lafayette 71 miles to the west; New Orleans is 68 miles to the east; and, the state capital Baton Rouge is 71 miles to the north. The port is, also, served by the Burlington Northern – Santa Fe Railroad (BNSF) which provides railcar shunting services on a weekly basis.

Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) service providers in the general Morgan City area include the port, as well as private sector shipbuilders and large-scale fabrication plants catering to the local, national and international energy markets. These facilities are located primarily along the Atchafalaya River and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in the communities of Franklin, Morgan City, Patterson, Bayou Vista, Berwick, Amelia, and Baldwin. In general, this area, including the Port of Morgan City and private offshore-oriented industrial operators located in the aforementioned communities, has been identified as the Morgan City supply base.

Traditionally, a port's role in a community is to serve as an intermodal transfer point for goods moving between water and land. As with smaller ports such as the PMC, these goods are either consumed or produced within the local markets and industries or are destined for the hinterland. Cargoes typically require water transportation, as well as land-based transportation systems, to reach their delivery point.

In 2014 Purina Mills International (PMI) became the only breakbulk tenant at the Port of Morgan City in over a decade. Purina Mills International ran an import/export breakbulk operation out of the Port of Morgan City. The operating costs were dependent on the vessel size deployed, in addition to the vessels' utilization. If the PMI operations could continue, the PMC was assumed to be able to handle increased vessel calls in the future to meet volumes two times that of 2014/2015. It was expected that there would be increased trade volume in future years. These increased trade volumes would necessitate either or both of the following: Increased vessel use; and/or, increased number of both, barge trips and ocean trips, in-and-out of the PMC. Future

operations could double revenues earned under those operations. If PMI could continue their operations at the Port of Morgan City, the estimated revenues are summarized in the following table:

Operation	Current Annual Estimate	Future Annual Estimate
Barge	\$33,600	\$67,200
Vessel	\$52,830	\$65,610
Rice Exports	\$54,800	\$54,800
Warehousing	\$21,292	\$121,667
Total	\$162,522	\$309,301

IMPACT OF ADDING MORE SHIPS CALLS

Subject to physical infrastructure at the port, additional vessel calls per month could have the potential for increasing barge and vessel-related revenues. Warehousing revenue can only increase through an increase of rates, as the future estimates of \$121,667 is based on 100% use of the warehouse.

It is important to note, however, beginning in January 2015 and extending through 2016, the region had been inundated with high-water events, including coastal and riverine flooding, for almost eighteen months. This is very unusual, but it was due to the unexpected large amounts of rainfall in eastern Texas, northern Louisiana (i.e., Shreveport/Bossier City; Monroe) and in the northern states of the U.S. The high water deposited tons of sediment (i.e., sand and fluff) into the river channel, causing the Atchafalaya River to lose about five-to-six feet of draft. Instead of having an 18'-20' draft, the Atchafalaya River now has a draft of 13'-16'. This has negated all the success that PMI was having here at the Port of Morgan City and has been detrimental to other local shipping companies because ships cannot use the river to enter or depart the Port of Morgan City without the risk of running aground; however, this is a temporary situation. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers began emergency dredging in mid-2016 to remedy the situation. Once the Atchafalaya River is dredged, the Port of Morgan City will be able to handle large ships requiring an 18'-20' draft.

Alternatives

In conducting this Benefit Cost Analysis for the FY 2017 TIGER Discretionary Grant proposal being submitted by the Morgan City Harbor and Terminal District, several alternatives to this project are offered for consideration.

1. <u>No Build Alternative</u>

Under this premise, the project is not implemented and no additional space is built. While there may be minimal business growth, it would be far less than what would occur if the dock is extended and the eastern dock enhancement is completed. If the "No Build" Alternative is selected, then the port's dock infrastructure remains the same and no additional space is created; therefore, ships and barges will be delayed in transloading their cargo, or they may have to wait for space on the dock to clear, while idling in the waterway, making them a water hazard for vessel traffic along the GIWW and Atchafalaya River. This will prolong the unnecessary and inefficient use of fuel, the ship/barge and crews.

Also, under the "No Build Alternative," ships and vessels could be "hipped" to each other at the dock, but this is inefficient due to the need to move ships and barges back-and-forth and because "hipped" vessels/barges at the dock jut-out into the waterway, posing as a marine hazard.

2. <u>Build Another Dock</u>

This is not an option for several reasons:

- a. There are no available accessible waterfront properties within the jurisdiction of the Port of Morgan City, let alone one with rail service (like at the port). While there is an island across from the facilities of the Port, it is undeveloped, lacks utility service and accessible only by a small-capacity cable-pulled ferry. If port-related vehicles (i.e., cargo trucks) and other vehicles would need to reach this island, then a multi-million bridge (tall enough to provide over 200 ft. of air-space clearance over the GIWW) would have to be built. This is cost prohibitive; and, there is no land available to build such a bridge.
- b. If land was available for development, additional costs would be incurred to purchase the property and then to develop the land into a port facility. Then there would be costs for development (i.e., land clearance, roads, utilities, etc.) a new dock and apron; building accessible roads to the new facility; and, the long-term permitting process. The cost for this would be far more than what is being requested from FY 2017 TIGER Discretionary Grant Program,
- c. Also, since the port could import cargo from a foreign country and be visited by a foreign-flagged vessel, the new dock/facility would have to go through

the rigorous process of having the site become a USCG-regulated Section 105 Facility. That would require the performance of a Facility Security Assessment, and the creation of a new facility security plan (FSP), or at the very least, the creation of an amendment to the current FSP.

3. <u>Rental of Another Dock</u>

Renting another dock may seem to be less expensive at first glance; but, there are no other sites available in the Port of Morgan City jurisdiction that has a dock with rail service, as it currently exists at the Port of Morgan City. In addition, there are no available docks to rent in the district that could provide the same service to vessels and barges that are currently being serviced at the Port of Morgan City (including a rail spur and being designated as a USCG-regulated 105 facility).

Long-Term Outcome and Types of Societal Benefits

The Port of Morgan City's analysis estimated the project's expected benefits with respect to each of the five long-term outcomes that the USDOT specified under "Selection Criteria" in the FY 2017 TIGER Discretionary Grant Notice of Funding. For purposes of this project, the analysis focuses on the following long-term outcomes:

- Quality of Life
- Economic Competiveness
- Safety
- State of Good Repair
- Environmental Sustainability

Each of the five expected outcomes are analyzed separately below, each followed by two matrices showing costs and benefits.

A. Quality of Life

By improving the dock along the GIWW, businesses will be able to ship their goods along Louisiana waterways and access the nation's inland waterway system. This will remove a great deal of truck traffic from the local, state and national highways and byways. In addition, this will reduce the amount of emissions that develop as a result of vehicles on the roadways, as well as reduce the number of traffic accidents since fewer vehicles will be on the highways.

Also, the grant proposal addresses the need to support existing communities. Since the jurisdiction of the Port of Morgan City includes the city of Morgan City and the town of Berwick, the Port helps to sustain these municipalities and the surrounding unincorporated areas of St. Mary Parish, as well as the surrounding parishes of Terrebonne, St. Martin, Iberia and Assumption by being an economic engine, creating jobs for the local region, creating vibrant communities and helping to support the local tax base. The Port alleviates traffic on the local roadways by providing the water system as a marine highway for the shipping of materials, which reduces the wear-and-tear on local roadways and bridges and the amount of pollution from automobiles and trucks.

Also, the Port's request improves the "Quality of Life" of communities and neighborhoods. The Port is located near a residential area. Seaports are usually located in great cities and are a key reason why certain communities flourish. "When discussing livability, one cannot overlook how quality of life in America is improved by providing our citizens the world's most robust access to market goods. Because of seaports, consumers enjoy less expensive options for purchasing food, clothing, medicine, fuel, technology, finished goods and building materials. Having less-expensive choices has allowed American families to better weather the economic downturn" (Nagle, 2010).

Additionally, this project will improve the quality of living and working environments and the experience of people in communities across the United States by shifting cargo operations to the marine modes of transportation and reducing the number of trucks that transport cargo on interstate highways. The project is positive for several measures of livability, including the following: congestion cost savings at the PMC, congestion cost savings on roads, and noise avoidance on roads.

Truck miles avoided in the build scenario mean less congested roads. The cost that truckdriven congestion imposed on other vehicles can be substantial. Improvements at the port, by making rail freight more efficient, reduce diversion to trucks and congestion for all the vehicles that remain on the highways, shorten travel times, and decrease vehicle operating expenses.

Under existing conditions, cargo operations at the PMC are not optimal because of the imperfect state of the dock. This creates congestion at the PMC that impacts the amount of time spent handling cargo/containers. Implementation of the project would reduce current and future levels of congestion at the port.

Therefore, the build scenario implies reduced operational times per vehicle at the port, lower vehicle emissions and noise, and reduced maintenance and repair of the vehicles and the yards. Although all these benefits are tangible and sensible, due to the lack of data to substantiate assumptions and the intension to produce conservative estimates of benefits, port officials can only evaluate congestion time savings for truck drivers at the port.

Mo	organ Ci	ty Harb	or and	Termina	l District								
Wha	Wharf Extension and Enhancement 2017 TIGER Discretionary Grant Application												
Prese	Present Value of Trucking Time Benefit												
					Annual								
					Payroll								
		Appual	Annual	Annual	Dollars								
		Truck	Number	Number of	Saved for								
	Calandan	Miles	of Trips	Hours Saved	TravelTime	NPV of Travel	NPV of Travel						
Year	 Vear	Saved	Saved	at 21.82 nours	at \$23.70 per	7 0%	3 0%						
Tear													
1	2018	9,216,000	5,760	125,683	\$2,978,692	\$2,783,824	\$2,891,934						
2	2019	9,216,000	5,760	125,683	\$2,978,692	\$2,601,705	\$2,807,703						
3	2020	9,216,000	5,760	125,683	\$2,978,692	\$2,431,500	\$2,725,925						
4	2021	9,216,000	5,760	125,683	\$2,978,692	\$2,272,430	\$2,646,529						
5	2022	18,432,000	11,520	251,366	\$5,957,384	\$4,247,532	\$5,138,891						
6	2023 18,432,000 11,520 251,366 \$5,957,384 \$3,969,656 \$4,989,215												
7	2024	18,432,000	11,520	251,366	\$5,957,384	\$3,709,959	\$4,843,898						
8	8 2025 19,200,000 12,000 261,840 \$6,205,608 \$3,611,720 \$4,898,764												
9	9 2026 19,200,000 12,000 261,840 \$6,205,608 \$3,375,440 \$4,756,082												
10	2027 19,968,000 12,480 272,314 \$6,453,832 \$3,280,801 \$												
11	2028	20,736,000	12,960	282,787	\$6,702,057	\$3,184,099	\$4,841,708						
12	2029	20,736,000	12,960	282,787	\$6,702,057	\$2,975,793	\$4,700,688						
13	2030	20,736,000	12,960	282,787	\$6,702,057	\$2,781,115	\$4,563,774						
14	2031	20,736,000	12,960	282,787	\$6,702,057	\$2,599,173	\$4,430,849						
15	2032	21,504,000	13,440	293,261	\$6,950,281	\$2,519,102	\$4,461,121						
16	2033	21,504,000	13,440	293,261	\$6,950,281	\$2,354,301	\$4,331,185						
17	2034	21,504,000	13,440	293,261	\$6,950,281	\$2,200,281	\$4,205,034						
18	2035	22,176,000	13,860	302,425	\$7,167,477	\$2,120,598	\$4,210,137						
19	2036	22,176,000	13,860	302,425	\$7,167,477	\$1,981,867	\$4,087,512						
20	2037	22,176,000	13,860	302,425	\$7,167,477	\$1,852,212	\$3,968,458						
					\$117,813,468	\$56,853,108	\$84,301,667						
	ASSUMPTIONS	<u>s</u>											
	- 1 barge = 3,5	500 tons; 1 tru	ck = 25 tons										
	-8 Barges/mo	onth X 3,500 to	ns/barge = 2	8,000 tons/mont	h								
	-(28,000 tons/	/month) / (25	tons/truck) =	1,120 trucks off	of road/month								
	-(1,120 trucks off of road/month) X (12 months/year) = 13,440 trucks off road/year												
	-The 1200 mile trip with a 55 MPH Average Takes 21.82 Hours Per Trip												
	-We did not adust for load/unload time as the barges will have load/unload time as well												
	-The Payroll C Economic Ana	Cost Per Hour alysis; Table 3	came from tł 3 (Revision)	ne Revised Depa	rtmental Guidar	ice on Valuation o	of Travel Time in						
	-We used a 7	.0% and a 3.0	% Discount R	ate									
	-There may b	e some imma	terial mathe	matical inconsi	stencies due to	rounding of fractio	onal amounts.						

Mo	organ Cit	ty Harbo	or and	Termi	nal Dis [.]	trict		
Whar	f Extension a	and Enhancer	ment 2017	TIGER Dis	cretionary	Grant Applicat	tion	
Prese	nt Value of I	Increased Ba	rge Time (` ost	,			
						Annual		
					Annual	Payroll		
				Annual	Number	Paylon	NPV of	NPV of
		Annual	Annual	Number	of Hours	Incurred for	Travel	Travel
		Truck	Number	of Barge	for the	Travel Time	Time	Time
	Calendar	Miles	of Trips	Trins Per	Barge	at \$51 21 Per	Savings	Savings
Year	Year	Saved	Saved	Year	Trips	Hour	7.0%	3.0%
					- P			
1	2018	9,216,000	5,760	96	5,376	\$275,305	\$257,294	\$267,286
2	2019	9,216,000	5,760	96	5,376	\$275,305	\$240,462	\$259,501
3	2020	9,216,000	5,760	96	5,376	\$275,305	\$224,731	\$251,943
4	2021	9,216,000	5,760	96	5,376	\$275,305	\$210,029	\$244,605
5	2022	18,432,000	11,520	192	10,752	\$550,610	\$392,577	\$474,961
6	2023	18,432,000	11,520	192	10,752	\$550,610	\$366,895	\$461,127
7	2024	18,432,000	11,520	192	10,752	\$550,610	\$342,892	\$447,696
8	2025	19,200,000	12,000	200	11,200	\$573,552	\$333,812	\$452,767
9	2026	19,200,000	12,000	200	11,200	\$573,552	\$311,974	\$439,580
10	2027	19,968,000	12,480	208	11,648	\$596,494	\$303,227	\$443,848
11	2028	20,736,000	12,960	216	12,096	\$619,436	\$294,290	\$447,494
12	2029	20,736,000	12,960	216	12,096	\$619,436	\$275,037	\$434,460
13	2030	20,736,000	12,960	216	12,096	\$619,436	\$257,044	\$421,806
14	2031	20,736,000	12,960	216	12,096	\$619,436	\$240,228	\$409,520
15	2032	21,504,000	13,440	224	12,544	\$642,378	\$232,827	\$412,318
16	2033	21,504,000	13,440	224	12,544	\$642,378	\$217,596	\$400,309
17	2034	21,504,000	13,440	224	12,544	\$642,378	\$203,360	\$388,649
18	2035	22,176,000	13,860	231	12,936	\$662,453	\$195,996	\$389,121
19	2036	22,176,000	13,860	231	12,936	\$662,453	\$183,174	\$377,787
20	2037	22,176,000	13,860	231	12,936	\$662,453	\$171,190	\$366,784
						¢10.000.005	65 254 C2C	67 704 FC4
						\$10,888,885	\$5,254,636	\$7,791,564
	ASSUMPTIONS							
	-It takes 1200	miles for one	one-way tri	p for barge	/truck			
	-Years 1-4 is c	alculated at 30) trips annı	ally				
	-Years 5-20 is	calculated at a	additional	trips due to	construction	completed		
	-8 harge trins	ner month X 12	months/v	ear =96 harg	e trins/vear	(Years 1-4)		
					e anps/year			
	-56 hours /bai	rge trip						
	-We did not a	dust for load/u	unload tim	e as the bar	ges will have	e load/unload t	ime as well	
	-We used a 7.	0% and a 3.0%	Discount R	ate				
	-The average	barge trip has	one deck h	and and on	e captain an	d takes 56 hour	s	
	(Deck Hand	\$17.32/hour + (antain \$33	89/hour = \$	51 21/hour a	verage)		
	Tue Cente in a	<i>J17.32/11001</i> • 0			51.21/11001 0	Verager		
	- rug captains							
	Salary Range	e s	\$33.89/hou	r				
	The U.S. Bur	eau of Labor St	atistics in	cludes tugbo	oat captains	in its category o	of captains, ma	tes and pilots
	of water ves	sels. These pr	rofessiona	s command	the operation	ons of ships and	d otheer water	vessels and
	maysupervi	se workes Th	eiraverage	salarvas o	f May 2010 w	as \$33.89/hour	or \$70.500/vea	r
	http://www.			= a.a., as o	alanı da -lik -	nd html		·
		.enow.com/Int	0_//433250	_average-s	arary-deckha			
	-There may be	e some immate	erial mathe	matical inco	onsistencies	due to roundin	g of fractional	amounts.

B. <u>Economic Competiveness</u>

This grant proposal enhances the port's economic competiveness, as well as for the companies that will use the port's facilities. Implementing the infrastructure extension and enhancement project improves its capacity to handle exports and/or imports. For example, there will be additional berthing space for ships to transload cargo; and, there will be additional lay-down areas of concrete.

This project will rebuild the physical infrastructure of the Port which will improve the local business climate. Infrastructure improvements can get goods and services to their markets. Inadequate infrastructure decreases access to economic opportunities and the ability to integrate into wider state, national and international markets. Programs to build and enhance ports bestow substantial economic benefits, such as job creation and business creation and retention to a community. Modernizing physical infrastructure can help improve the image of a distressed region, too.

If additional companies can use the port, more people can be hired to work at the port. An increase in jobs will off-set any losses that are occurring elsewhere in the local economy. With more people working, there will be an increase in local spending, business revenue and tax dollars for government programs.

Also, export/trade development and promotion enables firms to expand their market area and possibly extend the life-cycle of products or services that have exhausted their existing markets. Typically, firms do not have the resources to explore or develop an export marketing plan. Exporting can contribute to a firm's sales volume and create new jobs for the local economy.

St. Mary Parish's transportation network gives it access to the entire NAFTA region, in which U.S. companies can export products and services with low tariffs.

Also, the Port's request will improve the area's resiliency during emergencies, such as hurricanes. By having updated, modernized facilities, the Port will be able to remain in operation when a hurricane approaches. All other area ports will be out of operation for a while since they are not protected from a storm's tidal surge or high winds. Most of these area ports could be out of business for weeks, as what happened when Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Gustav and Ike impacted this area. The Port of Morgan City could serve as an alternate site for them until they are able to return to full operations. When a storm hits this region, a lot of physical damage is done to neighboring ports and their employees evacuate this area, leaving the other ports without a workforce. Because the Port of Morgan City is considered a "safe harbor," it could provide these area ports with a location to bring in relief equipment and organize their recovery efforts.

The BCA contained in this application concludes that the "Wharf Extension and Enhancement" project will promote economic competitiveness with shipper cost savings in association with truck diversion to rail and marine transportation modes. In the nobuild scenario, diversion to trucks is anticipated, creating a bottleneck that increases the generalized costs of fuel, time, reliability, and other items for shippers. The implementation of the project allows shippers that would have diverted to continue operations at the lower costs of maritime freight (especially for low inventory-cost commodities) realizing direct monetary cost savings.

Barge transportation is the most fuel-efficient mode of freight movement moving one ton of cargo 576 miles per gallon versus moving a ton of cargo only 155 miles by truck. Fuel cost savings reduces shipping and export costs to the users, agricultural producers and manufacturers. Factors involved in the assessment of economic competiveness include the following:

- Reduces Shippers' Costs
 - Less time for ship to stay in port/travel time savings
 - Less Labor Costs
 - Less Equipment Rental Costs
 - Less Fuel Costs
 - Due to less idling in River
 - Due to less distance for equipment to store cargo
 - No Pilot Fees
- Can transload multiple ships simultaneously
- Can store more cargo on dock area
- Improves and enhances long-term system efficiency in USA
- Based on a one-way 1200-mile trip to deliver cargo, there is Fuel Cost savings of \$86,946,323 (NPV 7%) and one of \$128,923,820 (NPV 3%).

Mo	organ Ci	ty Harbo	r and Terr	minal Distr	ict					
Wha	rf Extension	and Enhancem	ent 2017 TIGER	Discretionary Gra	Int Application					
Prese	ent Value of	Trucking Fuel I	Benefit							
		_	-	-						
	Colordon	Annual	Gallons of	Annual Fuel	NDV of Evol	NDV of Evol				
Year	Year	Saved	(Avg. 6 MPG)	\$4.01/Gal)	Savings 7.0%	Savings 3.0%				
			(,	<i>\(\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\</i>						
1	2018	9,216,000	1,536,000	\$6,159,360	\$5,756,411	\$5,979,961				
2	2019	9,216,000	1,536,000	\$6,159,360	\$5,379,824	\$5,805,788				
3	2020	9,216,000	1,536,000	\$6,159,360	\$5,027,872	\$5,636,687				
4	2021	9,216,000	1,536,000	\$6,159,360	\$4,698,946	\$5,472,512				
5	2022	18,432,000	3,072,000	\$12,318,720	\$8,783,077	\$10,626,236				
6	2023	18,432,000	3,072,000	\$12,318,720	\$8,208,483	\$10,316,734				
7	2024	18,432,000	3,072,000	\$12,318,720	\$7,671,480	\$10,016,247				
8	2025	19,200,000	3,200,000	\$12,832,000	\$7,468,341	\$10,129,699				
9	2026	19,200,000	3,200,000	\$12,832,000	\$6,979,758	\$9,834,660				
10	2027	19,968,000	3,328,000	\$13,345,280	\$6,784,064	\$9,930,142				
11	2028	20,736,000	3,456,000	\$13,858,560	\$6,584,102	\$10,011,719				
12	2029	20,736,000	3,456,000	\$13,858,560	\$6,153,366	\$9,720,115				
13	2030	20,736,000	3,456,000	\$13,858,560	\$5,750,810	\$9,437,005				
14	2031	20,736,000	3,456,000	\$13,858,560	\$5,374,589	\$9,162,141				
15	2032	21,504,000	3,584,000	\$14,371,840	\$5,209,016	\$9,224,737				
16	2033	21,504,000	3,584,000	\$14,371,840	\$4,868,239	\$8,956,056				
17	2034	21,504,000	3,584,000	\$14,371,840	\$4,549,756	\$8,695,200				
18	2035	22,176,000	3,696,000	\$14,820,960	\$4,384,987	\$8,705,752				
19	2036	22,176,000	3,696,000	\$14,820,960	\$4,098,119	\$8,452,186				
20	2037	22,176,000	3,696,000	\$14,820,960	\$3,830,018	\$8,206,006				
				\$243,615,520	\$117,561,259	\$174,319,581				
	ASSUMPTIONS									
	-1,200 miles per trip									
	-6 Miles Per Gallon is the Average MPG of the Trucks									
	-We used \$4.0)1 Per Gallon for	Fuel							
	-We did not a	djust the dollar	amounts for infla	tion over time						
	-We used a 7.	0% and a 3.0% D	scount Rate							
	-There may be	e some immateri	al mathematical	inconsistencies du	e to rounding of fra	ctional amounts.				

Mo	organ	City H	arbor	and T	ermin	al Disti	rict				
Wha	rf Extensi	on and Er	hanceme	nt 2017 T	IGER Disc	retionary G	rant Applicat	ion			
Pres	ent Value	of Increa	sed Barge	Fuel Cost	-						
			Annual		Annual			, ,			
		Number	Number	Number	in Tons	Annual	-				
		(Loads)	of Barge	of Barge	of	Gallons of	Annual Cost	NPV of Fuel	NPV of Fuel		
	Calendar	Peryear	Trips Per	Miles	Barge	Barge	of Barge	Used 7.0%	Used 3.0%		
Year	Year		Year	Per Year	Freight	Fuel Used	Fuel Used	(F/(1.07)^	(F/(1.03) [^]		
1	2018	7,680	96	115,200	192,000	400,000	\$1,604,001	\$1,499,066.62	\$1,557,283		
2	2019	7,680	96	115,200	192,000	400,000	\$1,604,001	\$1,400,996.84	\$1,511,925		
3	2020	7,680	96	115,200	192,000	400,000	\$1,604,001	\$1,309,342.84	\$1,467,888		
4	2021	7,680	96	115,200	192,000	400,000	\$1,604,001	\$1,223,684.90	\$1,425,134		
5	2022	15,360	192	230,400	384,000	800,001	\$3,208,003	\$2,287,261.49	\$2,767,251		
6	2023	15,360	192	230,400	384,000	800,001	\$3,208,003	\$2,137,627.56	\$2,686,652		
7	2024	15,360	192	230,400	384,000	800,001	\$3,208,003	\$1,997,782.77	\$2,608,400		
8	2025	16,000	200	240,000	400,000	833,334	\$3,341,669	\$1,944,881.98	\$2,637,945		
9	2026	16,000	200	240,000	400,000	833,334	\$3,341,669	\$1,817,646.71	\$2,561,111		
10	2027	16,640	208	249,600	416,000	866,667	\$3,475,336	\$1,766,684.65	\$2,585,976		
11	2028	17,280	216	259,200	432,000	900,001	\$3,609,003	\$1,714,611.27	\$2,607,220		
12	2029	17,280	216	259,200	432,000	900,001	\$3,609,003	\$1,602,440.44	\$2,531,282		
13	2030	17,280	216	259,200	432,000	900,001	\$3,609,003	\$1,497,607.89	\$2,457,555		
14	2031	17,280	216	259,200	432,000	900,001	\$3,609,003	\$1,399,633.54	\$2,385,976		
15	2032	17,920	224	268,800	448,000	933,334	\$3,742,670	\$1,356,515.72	\$2,402,277		
16	2033	17,920	224	268,800	448,000	933,334	\$3,742,670	\$1,267,771.70	\$2,332,308		
17	2034	17,920	224	268,800	448,000	933,334	\$3,742,670	\$1,184,833.37	\$2,264,377		
18	2035	18,480	231	277,200	462,000	962,501	\$3,859,628	\$1,141,924.68	\$2,267,125		
19	2036	18,480	231	277,200	462,000	962,501	\$3,859,628	\$1,067,219.33	\$2,201,092		
20	2037	18,480	231	277,200	462,000	962,501	\$3,859,628	\$997,401.24	\$2,136,982		
							\$63,441,592	\$30,614,936	\$45,395,761		
	ASSUMPTI	ONS									
	-The Avera	ige Numbe	er of Truck L	oads (TEU)	Per Barge	is 80					
	-The Trip I	Miles for t	he Barge is	1200 (This	is the sam	e as the Truc	cks)				
	-The Avera	ige Tons p	er TEU is 25								
	-The Avera	ige Fuel Co	onsumption	for the Ba	rge is 576	Miles Per Tor	n Per Gallon				
	-A Barge U	ISES 1 Gall		O IVIOVE 1 I	on of Carg	0 5/6 WILLES	Dor Dound Trin	- 4 166 67			
	(1 101) 570 miles x 2000 1011s / Barge Load X 1200 Miles Per Kound 111p = 4,100.07 Gallons of Fuel Per Barge Trin)										
	-We used	\$4.01 Per	Gallon for F	uel							
	-We did n	ot adjust t	he dollar ar	nounts for	inflation	over time					
	-We used	a 7.0% and	d a 3.0% Dis	count Rate							
	-As referre	d to abov	e, the Value	of the Cos	ts of Truck	Crashes was	s \$91,112				
	-inere ma	y be imma	iterial math	ematicali	nconsister	icies due to i	ounding of fra	ctional amounts			
	-96 barges	/vearX80	TEUs/barge	e = 7.680 TF	Us/vear						
	-96 barge	trips/year	X 1200 mile	s/trip = 115	5,200 miles	/year					
	-7,680 TEU	s/yearX25	5 avg tons/T	EU = 192,00	0 avg tons	/year					

C. Safety

There are safety benefits that will be derived from this project. For example, by being able to bring in more ships to the port's dock to transport cargo, less trucks will be on the highway. This will reduce the number of truck-related traffic accidents and deaths.

Barge transportation has fewer accidents per mile than other modes of freight transportation. It is estimated that the annual truck miles saved by diverting freight transportation to the marine corridor could reduce accidents due to the reduction of miles traveled by truck anywhere between 9,216,000 to 22,176,000 miles per year over time.

Safety benefits derived from this project are as follow:

- Increases space for machine equipment and humans to co-exist on dock, reducing chances for collision on dock;
- Increase in space allows drivable equipment (i.e., forklifts, trucks) to operate on east extension without going into water possibility
- Reduces ship/barge traffic accidents by getting ships/vessels out of waterway
- Reducing collisions on highways is a major benefit from this project. There is a reduction in collisions on the highway, generation cost savings amounting to \$10,096,681 (NPV 7%) and of \$14,971,336 (NPV3%).

Мо	rgan Cit	y I	Harbor a	n	d Termiı	na	al District							
Whar	Wharf Extension and Enhancement 2017 TIGER Discretionary Grant Application Present Value of Trucking Reduced Collision Benefit													
Prese	Wharf Extension and Enhancement 2017 TIGER Discretionary Grant Application Present Value of Trucking Reduced Collision Benefit													
					Reduced		Annual cost							
					Accidents @		of truck							
			Annual Truck		.63 per		collision							
	Calendar Miles Saved Million Savings NPV of NPV of Calendar Miles \$91,112 Avg. Collision Collision													
Year	Year				traveled		S91,112 Avg. Cost	Savings 7.0%	Savings 3.0%					
	Year Year traveled Cost Savings 7.0% Savings 3.0%													
1 2018 9,216,000 5.80608 \$529,004 \$494,396 \$513,596														
2 2019 9,216,000 5.80608 \$529,004 \$462,052 \$498,637														
3	2 2019 9,210,000 5.60008 \$529,004 \$462,052 \$498,637 3 2020 9,216,000 5.80608 \$529,004 \$431,824 \$484,113													
4	3 2020 9,210,000 5.00008 \$529,004 \$431,824 \$484,113 4 2021 9,216,000 5.80608 \$529,004 \$403,574 \$470,013													
5	4 2021 9,210,000 5.00008 5229,004 5403,574 \$470,013 5 2022 18,432,000 11.61216 \$1,058,007 \$754,344 \$912,646													
6	6 2023 18,432,000 11.61216 \$1,058,007 \$704,995 \$886,064													
7	7 2024 18,432,000 11.61216 \$1,058,007 \$658,874 \$860,257													
8	7 2024 18,432,000 11.61216 \$1,058,007 \$658,874 \$860,257 8 2025 19,200,000 12.096 \$1,102,091 \$641,427 \$870,001													
9	9 2026 19,200,000 12.096 \$1,102,091 \$599,464 \$844,661													
10	9 2020 19,200,000 12.090 \$1,102,091 \$599,464 \$844,661 10 2027 19,968,000 12.57984 \$1,146,174 \$582,657 \$852,861													
11	10 2027 19,968,000 12.57984 \$1,146,174 \$582,657 \$852,861 11 2028 20,736,000 13.06368 \$1,190,258 \$565,483 \$859,868													
12	2029		20,736,000		13.06368		\$1,190,258	\$528,489	\$834,823					
13	2030		20,736,000		13.06368		\$1,190,258	\$493,915	\$810,508					
14	2031		20,736,000		13.06368		\$1,190,258	\$461,603	\$786,901					
15	2032		21,504,000		13.54752		\$1,234,342	\$447,382	\$792,277					
16	2033		21,504,000		13.54752		\$1,234,342	\$418,114	\$769,201					
17	2034		21,504,000		13.54752		\$1,234,342	\$390,761	\$746,797					
18	2035		22,176,000		13.97088		\$1,272,915	\$376,610	\$747,703					
19	2036		22,176,000		13.97088		\$1,272,915	\$351,972	\$725,926					
20	2037		22,176,000		13.97088		\$1,272,915	\$328,945	\$704,782					
							\$20,923,193	\$10,096,881	\$14,971,633					
	ASSUMPTIO	<u>NS</u>												
	-The Value of	Coll	sion Reduction	Ва	sed Upon 2001	-20	003 Average Cost	s of Truck Crashes	5					
	Source:	Гed	Miller, Eduard	Zal	oshnja, Rebecc	a S	Sicer, Revised Co	st of Large Truck a	and Bus Involved					
	Crashes (2006), Adjusted to 2005 Dollars; US DOT Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration													
	-One barge = 80 trucks													
	-A one-way trip	o fro	om Morgan City	, LA	to Minneapoli	s,I	MN is 1200 miles	(barge/truck)						
	-We used a 7.0)% a	and a 3.0% Disc	oun	t Rate									
	-There may be	soi	me immaterial	mat	thematical inco	ons	sistencies due to	o rounding of frac	tional amounts.					

Мо	rgan Cit	ty Harb	or and	Termiı	nal Dist	rict					
Wharf	Extension a	and Enhanc	ement 201	7 TIGER Dis	cretionary G	Grant Applica	tion				
Preser	resent Value of Increased Barge Collision Cost										
					-						
					Increased	Annual					
			Annual	Annual	@ .028 for	Barge	-	-			
		Number	Number	Number	Every	Collision	NPV of	NPV of			
		of TEU	of Barge	of Barge	Billion	Incurred at	Annual	Annual			
	Calendar	Pervear	Trips Per	Miles	Miles	an \$91,112	Maintenance	Maintenance			
Year	Year	Ter yeur	Year	Per Year	Collisions	Avg Cost	Cost 7.0%	Cost 3.0%			
1	2018	7,680	96	115,200	0.000115	\$10.50	\$9.81	\$10.19			
2	2019	7,680	96	115,200	0.000115	\$10.50	\$9.17	\$9.89			
3	2020	7,680	96	115,200	0.000115	\$10.50	\$8.57	\$9.61			
4	2021	7,680	96	115,200	0.000115	\$10.50	\$8.01	\$9.33			
5	2022	15,360	192	230,400	0.000230	\$20.99	\$14.97	\$18.11			
6	2023	15,360	192	230,400	0.000230	\$20.99	\$13.99	\$17.58			
7	2024	15,360	192	230,400	0.000230	\$20.99	\$13.07	\$17.07			
8	2025	16,000	200	240,000	0.000240	\$21.87	\$12.73	\$17.26			
9	2026	16,000	200	240,000	0.000240	\$21.87	\$11.89	\$16.76			
10	2027	16.640	208	249.600	0.000250	\$22.74	\$11.56	\$16.92			
11	2028	17 280	216	259 200	0.000259	\$23.62	\$11.22	\$17.06			
12	2029	17 280	216	259 200	0.000259	\$23.62	\$10.49	\$16.56			
13	2030	17 280	216	259 200	0.000259	\$23.62	\$9.80	\$16.08			
14	2030	17,200	210	250,200	0.000255	\$23.02	\$9.80	\$15.60			
15	2031	17,200	210	255,200	0.000255	\$23.02	¢0 00	\$15.01			
15	2032	17,920	224	208,800	0.000209	\$24.49	00.0¢	\$15.72			
10	2055	17,920	224	200,000	0.000209	\$24.49	\$0.30	\$13.20			
1/	2034	17,920	224	208,800	0.000209	\$24.49 ¢25.20	\$7.75	\$14.82			
18	2035	18,480	231	277,200	0.000277	\$25.26	\$7.47	\$14.84			
19	2036	18,480	231	277,200	0.000277	\$25.26	\$6.98	\$14.40			
20	2037	18,480	231	277,200	0.000277	\$25.26	\$6.53	\$13.98			
						Ş415	\$200	\$297			
	ASSUMP	TIONS									
	-The Valu	e of the In	creased Bar	ge Collisior	n Cost was s	et at \$91,121	, the same as	the Truck			
	Collision	Cost as a re	sult of Non	-Availabilit	y of Barge (Collision Cost	Statistics				
	-The Increased Cost of Barge Collision is .028 for Each Billion Ton Miles										
	-8 barges	travel to N	1N each moi	nth X 12 mc	onths = 96 ba	arges/year. I	ncrease in bar	ges occur			
	after com	pletion of	project.								
	-It's a 120	0 mile trip	by barge to	MN one wa	ay. Barges o	do not return	to Morgan Cit	у.			
	-We used	a 7.0% and	d a 3.0% Disc	count Rate							
	-As referred to above, the Value of the Costs of Truck Crashes was \$91,112										
	-There m	ay be imma	aterial math	ematical ir	consistenci	ies due to rou	unding of fract	ional			
	amounts										

D. State of Good Repair

The proposed project is consistent with efforts to maintain transportation facilities in a state of good repair. The new dock improvement will eliminate existing inefficiencies and eliminate a physical barrier to the layout of cargo storage by providing a flat, rigid and consistent surface (concrete) to increase safety and reduce transit time, generally increasing functionality and the efficient movement of goods and services through the PMC. The "Wharf Extension and Enhancement" project will upgrade surface transportation assets. The port has out-grown its existing dock. If left unimproved, the port will fail in reaching an effective mode.

The project is part of a phased capital improvement plan developed by port officials and the public to upgrade port facilities and expand capacity at its riverfront facilities to meet existing demands and attract new business. The proposed project is capitalized up-front, using asset management approaches to optimize long-term cost structure. The cost estimate of \$15,000,000 was derived from a breakdown of construction items from a preliminary design analysis and based on recent bid prices for similar projects, including factors for contingencies and inflation. The local office of the international engineering firm Moffatt and Nichol, who is extremely experienced in all phases of construction projects, provided the construction cost estimate and project timeline.

Consequently, the following benefits are derived from this project:

- Reduced maintenance and repair costs
- Keeps facility open to handle ships and cargo
- More area to store cargo
- Improves Port's existing infrastructure
- Maintaining a dock in good condition can prolong the use of it for years beyond its normal life-cycle. It appears that over the years, with maintenance, preservation and upgrades, there are benefits that may total approximately \$549,130 (NPV 7%) and \$798,533 (NPV 3%).

Morga	an City Har	bor and ⁻	Terminal	District		
Wharf Ext	ension and Enha	ncement 2017 [.]	TIGER Discretio	onary Grant Applicat	tion	
Present V	alue of Maintena	ance and Opera	ations Cost			
				NPV of		NPV of
			-	Annual		Annual
			Annual	Maintenance		Maintenance
Voor	Calendar		Maintenance	Cost 7.0%		Cost 3.0%
rear	fear		COST	(F/(1.07)		(F/(1.03)
1	2018		\$39,000	\$36,449		\$37,864
2	2019		\$41.000	\$35.811		\$38.646
3	2020		\$44,000	\$35,917		\$40,266
4	2021		\$46,000	\$35,093		\$40,870
5	2022		\$48,000	\$34,223		\$41.405
6	2022		\$51,000	\$33,983		\$42 712
7	2023		\$51,000	\$31,760		\$41 468
8	2024		\$51,000	\$29.682		\$40,260
0	2025		\$51,000	\$25,002		\$30 087
10	2020		\$51,000	\$27,741		\$35,087
11	2027		\$51,000	\$25,920		\$37,343
12	2028		\$59,000	\$26,050		\$42,025
12	2029		\$59,000	\$20,197		\$41,381
14	2030		\$59,000 ¢F0,000	\$24,405		\$40,176
14	2031		\$59,000	\$22,881		\$39,006
15	2032		\$59,000	\$21,384		\$37,870
16	2033		\$67,000	\$22,695		\$41,752
1/	2034		\$67,000	\$21,210		\$40,536
18	2035		\$67,000	\$19,823		\$39,355
19	2036		\$67,000	\$18,526		\$38,209
20	2037		\$67,000	\$17,314		\$37,096
				4		4
			\$1,103,000	\$549,130		\$798,533
	ASSUMPTIC	NS:				
	-We Did not	t Adjust the Do	llar Amounts f	or Inflation over tin	าย	
	-We Used a	7.0% and a 3.0	% Discount Ra	te		
	-The Annua replacing liؤ systems.	l Maintenance ght systems, el	Cost Per Year ectrical boxes,	will provide funds f /wiring, pipes/valve	or mai es, and	ntaining, fendering
	-There may fractional a	be Immaterial mounts	Mathematical	Inconsistencies du	e to ro	unding of

E. Environmental Sustainability

Environmental costs are increasingly considered as an important component in the evaluation of transportation projects. The environmental impacts of vehicle use and exhaust emissions can impose wide-ranging social costs on people, material, and vegetation. The negative effects of pollution depend not only on the quantity of pollution produced, but, also, on the types of pollutants emitted: carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, particulate matter, sulfur dioxide and carbon dioxide, as well as the conditions under which the pollution is released. The environmental cost reduction is calculated as the difference between the cost of vessel pollution and truck pollution.

 CO^2 emissions will be reduced over time due to the reduction of trucking-related carbon emissions. Barge transportation is the most fuel-efficient mode of freight transportation when compared to shipping by rail or truck.

In summary, this project has the following benefits regarding environmental sustainability:

- Reduces emissions
- Less damage to wetlands from idling in river
- Reduces consumption of fossil fuels
- Protecting the environment is important with any project. Based on the various data, there is a CO2 cost savings of \$6,263,879 (NPV 7%) and \$9,467,021 (NPV 3%).

Mc	organ	City Ha	rbor an	d Term	inal Di	strict				
Wha	rf Extensio	on and Enh	ancement 2	017 TIGER D	iscretionar	y Grant Applicat	ion			
Prese	ent Value	of Truckin	g Carbon Re	duction Emi	ssions Ben	efit				
					CO2	Annual Dollars		-		
		Annual	Annual	Annual	Emissions	Saved Due to		-		
		Truck	Gallons of	Metric Tons	Price Per	Reduced CO2	NPV of CO2	NPV of CO2		
	Calendar	Miles	Fuel Saved	of CO2	Metric	Emissions Per	Emissions	Emissions		
Year	Year	Saved	(Avg. 6 MPG)	Saved	Ton	Metric Ton	Savings 7.0%	Savings 3.0%		
1	2018	9,216,000	1,536,000	15,464	\$24.30	\$375,787	\$351,203	\$364,842		
2	2019	9,216,000	1,536,000	15,464	\$24.80	\$383,519	\$334,981	\$361,504		
3	2020	9,216,000	1,536,000	15,464	\$25.30	\$391,252	\$319,378	\$358,051		
4	2021	9,216,000	1,536,000	15,464	\$25.80	\$398,984	\$304,383	\$354,492		
5	2022	18,432,000	3,072,000	30,929	\$26.30	\$813,432	\$579,966	\$701,674		
6	2023	18,432,000	3,072,000	30,929	\$26.80	\$828,897	\$552,329	\$694,188		
7	2024	18,432,000	3,072,000	30,929	\$27.30	\$844,361	\$525,826	\$686,543		
8	2025	19,200,000	3,200,000	32,218	\$27.80	\$895,652	\$521,277	\$707,036		
9	2026	19,200,000	3,200,000	32,218	\$28.30	\$911,761	\$495,937	\$698,789		
10	2027	19,968,000	3,328,000	33,506	\$28.80	\$964,984	\$490,549	\$718,039		
11	2028	20,736,000	3,456,000	34,795	\$29.30	\$1,019,496	\$484,355	\$736,506		
12	2029	20,736,000	3,456,000	34,795	\$29.80	\$1,036,894	\$460,393	\$727,257		
13	2030	20,736,000	3,456,000	34,795	\$30.30	\$1,054,292	\$437,494	\$717,921		
14	2031	20,736,000	3,456,000	34,795	\$30.80	\$1,071,689	\$415,620	\$708,513		
15	2032	21,504,000	3,584,000	36,084	\$31.30	\$1,129,423	\$409,355	\$724,934		
16	2033	21,504,000	3,584,000	36,084	\$31.80	\$1,147,465	\$388,686	\$715,062		
17	2034	21,504,000	3,584,000	36,084	\$32.30	\$1,165,507	\$368,970	\$705,151		
18	2035	22,176,000	3,696,000	37,211	\$32.80	\$1,220,535	\$361,112	\$716,936		
19	2036	22,176,000	3,696,000	37,211	\$33.30	\$1,239,141	\$342,633	\$706,665		
20	2037	22,176,000	3,696,000	37,211	\$33.80	\$1,257,746	\$325,026	\$696,384		
						\$18,150,817	\$8,469,472	\$12,800,483		
	ASSUMPTIC	<u>DNS</u>								
	-CO2 Emiss	sions from a	Gallon of Die	esel = 2,778 G	rams X 0.99 >	((44/12) = 10,084 G	rams = 10.1 kg/G	allon = 22.2		
	Pounds/G	allon/2205	Pounds Per To	n: EPA - Offic	e of Transpo	rtation; Average C	arbon Dioxide			
	Emissions Resulting from Gasoline and Diesel Fuel, 2005									
	page2; htt	tp://www.ep	oa.gov/otaq/cl	imate/420f05	001.pdf					
	-6 Miles Pe	er Gallon is	the average N	/IPG of the Tru	cks					
	-We used	Cost Per Me	tric Ton for the	e Cost of Carb	on as Shown	in the Social Cost	t			
	of Carbon	for Regulat	ory Impact An	alysis Under	Executive Ord	der 12866				
	(February	2010)								
	-We used	a 7.0% and a	a 3.0% Discour	nt Rate						
	-There may	y be some ii	mmaterial ma	the matical ir	consistenci	es due to rounding	g of fractional an	10unts.		

Mo	organ	City H	larbo	r and	Term	inal Dis	trict					Π
Wha	rf Extensi	on and E	nhancem	ent 2017	7 TIGER D	iscretionary	Grant Appl	ication				
Pres	ent Value	of Increa	ased Barg	ze Carbor	n Emissio	n Cost						1
									Annual			
					-	_			Dollars			T
			Annual	A		_	A		Due to		ſ.	
		Number	Number	Annual	- Annual Number	Annual	Annual Metric		Increased	-	6	
		(Loads)	of Barge	of Barge	in Tons	Gallons of	Tons of	Emissions	Emissions	NPV of Fuel	NPV of Fuel	
	Calendar	Pervear	Trips	Miles	of Barge	Barge Fuel	CO2	Price Per	Per Metric	Used 7.0%	Used 3.0%	H
Year	Year	,	Per Year	Per Year	Freight	Used	Generated	Metric Ton	Ton	(F/(1.07)^	(F/(1.03)^	
1	2018	7,680	96	115,200	192,000	400,000	4,027	\$24.30	\$97,861	\$91,459.16	\$95,010.97	
2	2019	7,680	96	115,200	192,000	400,000	4,027	\$24.80	\$99,875	\$87,234.61	\$94,141.68	
3	2020	7,680	96	115,200	192,000	400,000	4,027	\$25.30	\$101,889	\$83,171.38	\$93,242.43	
4	2021	7,680	96	115,200	192,000	400,000	4,027	\$25.80	\$103,902	\$79,266.43	\$92,315.69	
5	2022	15,360	192	230,400	384,000	800,001	8,054	\$26.30	\$211,831	\$151,032.90	\$182,727.68	
6	2023	15,360	192	230,400	384,000	800,001	8,054	\$26.80	\$215,859	\$143,835.75	\$180,778.24	
7	2024	15,360	192	230,400	384,000	800,001	8,054	\$27.30	\$219,886	\$136,933.88	\$178,787.35	
8	2025	16,000	200	240,000	400,000	833,334	8,390	\$27.80	\$233,243	\$135,749.44	\$184,124.03	
9	2026	16,000	200	240,000	400,000	833,334	8,390	\$28.30	\$237,438	\$129,150.45	\$181,976.33	T
10	2027	16,640	208	249,600	416,000	866,667	8,726	\$28.80	\$251,298	\$127,747.24	\$186,989.43	T
11	2028	17,280	216	259,200	432,000	900,001	9,061	\$29.30	\$265,494	\$126,134.33	\$191,798.58	T
12	2029	17.280	216	259.200	432.000	900.001	9.061	\$29.80	\$270.025	\$119.894.20	\$189.389.90	T
13	2030	17.280	216	259,200	432.000	900.001	9.061	\$30.30	\$274.555	\$113.930.70	\$186.958.81	
14	2031	17,280	216	259,200	432,000	900.001	9,061	\$30.80	\$279,086	\$108,234,34	\$184 508 68	
15	2032	17,920	224	268,800	448,000	933,334	9,397	\$31.30	\$294,121	\$106,602,94	\$188,784,99	
16	2032	17,920	224	268,800	448 000	933 334	9 397	\$31.80	\$298,819	\$101,220,43	\$186 214 30	1
17	2034	17,920	224	268,800	448 000	933 334	9 397	\$32.30	\$303 518	\$96.085.93	\$183,633,20	
10	2034	18 / 80	224	200,000	462,000	962 501	9,690	\$32.50	\$317.848	\$94,039,72	\$186 702 13	
10	2035	10,400	231	277,200	402,000	062 501	0,600	\$32.00	\$222 602	\$94,035.72	\$180,702.13	+
20	2030	10,400	231	277,200	402,000	902,501	9,090	\$33.30	\$322,095	\$84,642,14	\$184,027.37	
20	2037	10,400	251	277,200	402,000	902,301	9,090	333.60	3327,338	\$64,042.14	\$181,330.03	
									¢4 726 770	\$2 205 E02	¢2 222 462	+
									\$4,720,779	\$2,205,595	\$3,333,402	-
	ASSUMPTI	ONS	· - ·									
	-The Avera	age Numb	er of Truck	Loads (TE	U) Per Bar	ge is 80					L	
	-The Trip	Miles for t	he Barge	is 1200 (Th	nis is the s	ame as the Ti	rucks)				L	
	-The Avera	age Tons p	per TEU is	25							L	
	-The Avera	age Fuel C	onsumpti	on for the	Barge is 5	76 Miles Per T	on Per Gallo	n			L	
	-A Barge Uses 1 Gallon of Fuel to Move 1 Ton of Cargo 576 Miles											
	(1 Ton/ 576 mies x 2000 Tons / Barge Load X 1200 Miles Per Round Trip = 4166.67 Gallons of Fuel Per Barge Trip)											
	-CO2 Emis	sions fron	n a gallon	ofdiesel	= 2,778 gra	1ms X 0.99 X (4	4/12) = 10,08	4 grams = 10	1 kg/Gallon =	22.2		+
		Pounds/G	iallon/220	5 Pounds	Per Ton; EF	PA - Office of T	ransportatio	n: Average C	arbon Dioxide	2		
		Emission	s Resultin	g from Ga	soline and	l Diesel fuel,	2005.					
	page 2; http://www.epa.gov/otaq/climate/420f05001.pdf											
	-We did n	ot adjust 1	the dollar	amounts	for inflatio	on over time						
	-We used	a 7.0% an	d a 3.0% D	iscount R	ate							
	-There ma	ybe imma	aterial ma	thematica	alinconsis	tencies due t	o rounding o	f fractional a	amounts.			

Μ	lorgan City Ha	rbor and Terr	ninal Distr	ict			
Wh	harf Extension and Enh	ancement 2017 TIGER	Discretionary Gra	ant Application			
Bei	nefit Cost Summary						
				NPV c	of 7.0%	NPV	of 3%
	Present Value of Truckir	ng Time Benefit		\$56,853,108		\$84,301,667	
	Present Value of Increas	sed Barge Time Cost		(\$5,254,636)		(\$7,791,564)	
1	Net Present Value of	Time Benefit			\$51,598,472		\$76,510,103
	Present Value of Truckir	ng Fuel Benefit		\$117,561,259		\$174,319,581	
	Present Value of Increas	sed Barge Fuel Cost		<u>(\$30,614,936)</u>		(\$45,395,761)	
2	Net Present Value of	Fuel Benefits			\$86,946,323		\$128,923,820
						440.000.400	
	Present Value of Truckin	ig Carbon Reduction Emm	issions Benefit	\$8,469,472		\$12,800,483	
	Present value of Increas	sed Barge Carbon Emissio	on Cost	(\$2,205,593)	¢6.050.070	(\$3,333,462)	40.467.004
3	Net Present value of	Carbon Reduction Emissi	on Benefit		\$6,263,879		\$9,467,021
	Drocont Value of Truckir	a Roducod Collision Bon	ofite	¢10.006.991		¢14.071.622	
	Present Value of Increase	ed Barge Collision Cost		\$10,090,881		(\$207)	
Δ	Net Present Value of	Reduced Collision Benef	it	(\$200)	\$10,096,681	(7257)	\$14 971 336
-		Reduced comston benef			\$10,050,001		Ş14,571,550
5	Net Present Value of All	Benefits			\$154,905,355		\$229,872,280
6	Present Value of Mainte	nance and Operation Co	sts		\$549,130		\$798,533
7	Present Value of Constru	uction Costs			\$15,000,000		\$15,000,000
8	Less Present Value of Re	emaining Capital Value			(\$2,325,771)		(\$4,983,082)
9	Net Present Value of All	Costs			\$13,223,359		\$10,815,451
10	Net Present Value = 5 - 9	9			\$141,681,996		\$219,056,829
11	Benefit / Cost Ratio = 5/	9		(11 71 to 1 00)	11 71	(21.25 to 1.00)	21.25
				(11.71 (0 1.00)	11./1	(21.25 (0 1.00)	21.25

Affected Population

The Morgan City Harbor and Terminal District's "Wharf Extension and Enhancement" will have different impacts over the course of the life-time of the project (estimated to be 50 years). Evidently, by being able to transfer the shipping of cargo from truck, the project will reduce the number of trucks on the highway and reduce the amount of emissions in the atmosphere. This action will, also, reduce the number of accidents on the highway involving trucks. The groups who will benefit from this project include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Shippers/vessel operators
- Local workers

Conclusion

Based on the information included in this analysis, the Morgan City Harbor and Terminal District's "*Wharf Extension and Enhancement*" project will have a benefit of 21.25 to 1 (at NPV 3.0%) and a 11.71 to 1 benefit ratio (at 7.0% NPV). The project is determined to be feasibly beneficial.

Current Status and Problem to be addressed	Change to Baseline/ Alternatives	Types of Impacts	Population Affected by Impact	Economic Benefit	Summary of Results	Page Reference in BCA
25-year old	450' foot	Increased	Shipping	Monetized	The	Pages 6-23
Dock is not	extension,	export/import	carriers;	value of	benefits to	
large enough	and	capacity; time	Exporters	reduced	cost	
to meet	additional	and fuel cost	and	travel times,	analysis	
future	laydown	savings; State	Importers	fuel	indicates a	
demands and	area of @	of Good		consumption,	benefit of	
to expand	64,000 sf	Repair		emissions	21.25 to 1	
export/import		through the		and safety	(at a 3.0%	
opportunities		reduction of		benefits	NPV) and	
		long-term			11.71 to 1	
		maintenance			(at a 7.0%	
		and repair			NPV)	
		costs				

References

Amdal, J., Swigart, S., Jayawardana, J., Ashar, A., & Duplechain, R. (2008). *Port of Morgan City.* New Orleans: University of New Orleans.

Moffatt & Nichol. (2015). Port of Morgan City Market Analysis.

Richardson, James A. (2015). Economic Impact Related to Loss of PMI Operations at Port of Morgan City.