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Common National Trends

- Increasing coastal property values and taxes
- Increasing demands for waterfront land (e.g. luxury condos)
- Complex and time-consuming permitting processes
- Declining U.S. fishing industry
Further exacerbating these pressures...

- A significant increase in population* is expected in coastal areas.
- Waterfront land is essentially a nonrenewable resource.
- Waterfront land suitable for water-dependent uses is scarce.
Ports are associated with a variety of economic and cultural benefits:

- **Economic**: trade, jobs, recreation,* tourism, natural resources…
- **Cultural/Social/Historical**: fishing traditions, spiritual connections, recreation, Jimmy Buffet…

*However, recreation can cut both ways; as demand for space and resources for recreational boating may compete with the same for commercial...*
Port development, maintenance, and operation all cost money

- Dredging
- Infrastructure development and maintenance
- Acquiring adequate waterfront land
- Planning
- Port operations
State legislation can result in funding for ports…

- Grant or Loan programs
- Dedicated funds from transportation trust funds
- Bonding/Taxing power
- One time appropriations for particular projects? (uncertainty)
Bonding/Taxing Powers

- Statewide port authorities created to oversee a particular waterfront area, or multiple areas

- Local governments conferred the authority to create port districts/authorities (by general law)

- Local port districts/authorities established by state legislation for a particular area (by special act)
Maryland & Virginia

- Both have **one major port complex** managed by **one major port authority** and both are receive their funding from the state **transportation trust fund**

- **Maryland Port Administration** (a modal unit of the Maryland Department of Transportation)
- **Virginia Ports Authority** (an independently operated unit of the state)

---

*The Commonwealth Port Fund in VA was created within the transportation trust fund and it receives 4.2% of the fund’s revenue each year (note that smaller ports in the state may apply to the Virginia Port Administration to receive funds from the 4.2%)

**The Virginia Port Administration has established a non-profit – Virginia International Terminals, Inc. – to manage day-to-day operations*
Washington & Oregon

- Both states authorize port districts and confer the power to **levy taxes** and **issue bonds**

- **Washington** has the most port districts in the U.S. and is the largest locally controlled port system in the world

- **Oregon** offers a number of state funding programs in addition to broad powers local port districts may exercise
Alaska

- Municipalities may establish port authorities with the power to issue bonds, but not to levy taxes
- Notable and interesting funding opportunities
  - Municipal Harbor Facility Grant Fund for small boat facilities
  - Distributions from a *Fisheries Business Tax* and a “*Cruise Ship Passenger Tax*”
Ohio, Illinois, Minnesota, & Wisconsin

- All authorize local port districts in some form

- Ohio:
  - Districts may issue bonds and levy taxes

- Illinois:
  - Depends on particular enabling statute

- Minnesota:
  - Districts may issue bonds
  - Districts may not directly levy taxes (except for seaway port authorities)
  - Upon request, cities with a port authority must levy taxes for the authority

- Wisconsin:
  - Districts may issue bonds and levy taxes
Pennsylvania

- Directly created a variety of regional port entities
- Interstate compact creating Delaware Port Authority
- Indirectly authorized the creation of port authorities in certain classes of cities

Funding from the office of PennPORTS:

The authorities at Erie, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh send funding requests to PennPORTS, and PennPORTS submits an annual request to the Governor for funds from the state General Fund.
New York & New Jersey

- Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (created and governed by interstate compact)
Florida

- Revenues from state motor vehicle registrations
  - prescribed amount from MV registration annually deposited into Transportation Trust Fund
  - These revenues go to ports enumerated as part of the Florida Seaport Transportation and Economic Development Council (via the Florida Seaport Transportation and Economic Development Program)
- Taxing and bonding powers of authorities
Without Funding Programs…

- SC, NC, NY, NJ, IN, & GA → no funding program
- Rhode Island & Delaware → no funding program and no mechanism for public ports to impose taxes or issue bonds
- Alabama & Texas → funding programs exist, but not supported
Florida Focus

Florida has 15 Statutory Deepwater Ports.

Competition among each other for funding/support.

Traditional Working Water Fronts lose out. Florida’s forgotten ports.

Florida State Law Benefits Statutory Ports over Traditional Working Waterfronts

Funding Mechanisms

- Taxing Authority
- Bonding Authority
- Local Political Control

Streamlined Permitting – “Port Conceptual Permits”
Florida’s Forgotten Ports

Factors

- More people moving to the coast. More than half the U.S. population (153 million people) living in coastal zones.

- People 65+ in coastal zones expected to rise.

- Real estate values increase. Property Taxes.

- Development pressures to meet residential use demand (“Dock-o-miniums”)

- Change in water related uses to more recreational. Emphasis on Cruise Ship Industry.

- Decline in fishing industry.

Traditional Working Water Fronts lose out. Similar themes nation-wide.
Florida has many smaller Working Waterfront Communities dotting coast.

Economic dependence on water related and water dependent activities.

Working Waterfronts Legislation (2005), established Working Waterfront Program.

Planning & Technical Assistance – Julie Dennis, Planning Analys, Florida Dept. of Economic Opportunity.
Florida State Law & Working Waterfronts

Defines Recreational & Commercial Working Waterfronts.

Defines purpose of Waterfronts Florida Program

Florida Reform ideas-

Deep-water Dependency Test

CRA District expanded authority for water-related improvements.
Conclusions

General Challenges for Working Waterfronts very similar nation-wide.

Independence of local governments and each state determines how Working Waterfronts are treated.

Legislation Specifically promoting Working Waterfronts can be helpful. Statutory Definitions distinguishing water-related, water-dependent land uses must be implemented by the entities controlling ports/working waterfronts.