

# Michigan has generally settled for “fair to good” levels of infrastructure planning, funding and financing practices, while it should be striving for “better or best.”



Two separate yet complementary expert panels have independently reached the same conclusions about key strategies for improving Michigan’s infrastructure:

	21st Century Infrastructure Commission Report Recommendations	BLM Report: Investing in Michigan’s Infrastructure
--	---	--

## The Need

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roughly \$4 Billion per Year</li> </ul>	✓	✓
--	---	---

## The Goal

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic Prosperity</li> <li>Safe, Healthy Communities</li> <li>Sustainable Environment</li> </ul>	✓	✓
---	---	---

## The Plan

<b>Asset Management</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure accurate information on the condition of infrastructure assets</li> <li>Prioritize future needs/actions</li> </ul>	✓	✓
<b>Coordinated Planning</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create a statewide body to coordinate infrastructure-related goals.</li> </ul>	✓	✓
<b>Sustainable Funding</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reexamine existing funding mechanisms and the potential for new funding options.</li> </ul>	✓	✓
<b>Innovative Funding Strategies</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pilot innovative funding strategies identified as part of leading practices review</li> </ul>	✓	✓
<b>Utilize Emerging Technologies</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stay at the forefront of innovative technologies that impact infrastructure planning and delivery</li> </ul>	✓	✓

## The Path Forward

Business Leaders for Michigan supports significant new funding to support long-term infrastructure solutions that meet the following policy principles:

- Needs should be prioritized based on economic, health and safety risks, with transportation and water systems given highest priority.
- Regional and cross-functional coordination and resultant efficiencies should be rewarded.
- Public-private partnerships and alternative financing methods should be fully utilized.
- Funding should be sufficient to ensure at least “good” and ideally “best” quality conditions.
- Warranties on work should be required.
- Funding should be both sustainable and dedicated.
- Revenue should come from the users of the infrastructure – which means all of us. General purpose taxes (e.g., sales and income taxes) that fund the balance of state government should not be utilized.
- User fees should reflect the true cost of service, including the replacement or rehabilitation of aging infrastructure.
- A renewable bond program and/or regional assessment could be used to fund one-time or recurring needs that cannot be reasonably addressed through user-based funding. However, the revenue source should not adversely impact other critical priorities that help create jobs, such as job training, higher education and economic development.
- A statewide non-partisan, multi-infrastructure council composed of professional subject-matter experts should be established to recommend strategic prioritization of investments, maximize capture of federal dollars, facilitate public-private partnerships, oversee a coordinated asset management system and possibly coordinate projects of state significance.