



The Hidden Risks of P3s

By Elizabeth K. Kellar

P3s are an important part of the infrastructure toolkit, but they can't replace tax-exempt debt.

State and local governments are eager to find ways to address the infrastructure deficit. While both the Obama administration and the Trump White House have promoted a greater use of public-private partnerships (P3s), government officials are well advised to bring rigorous analysis and staff expertise to the negotiating table to avoid costly mistakes and minimize risks for taxpayers.

Recent news coverage highlights the importance of careful analysis. A recent article in the *New York Times* reported on a long-term deal that Bayonne, New Jersey, cut with a private equity firm in 2012 to manage the city's water system. While the city got an immediate infusion of investment in its ailing water system, residents saw their bills rise by 28 percent. City officials had expected rates to be frozen for four years after an initial bump. The rate freeze did not occur, in part because residents had conserved more water than expected, which reduced the amount of revenue the private-sector partner had negotiated.

And in Virginia, the *Washington Post* reported that one of the state's top transportation priorities has run into

a financial hurdle. The state seeks to expand a tunnel in the notoriously congested Hampton Roads region. The project could be costlier than expected due to a non-compete clause negotiated in a 2011 agreement with Elizabeth River Crossings (ERC), a partnership between a Swedish construction company and an Australian finance group. The 58-year agreement stipulates that if ERC's toll revenue falls after the tunnel project is built, the state might be required to make up the difference.

Of course, some P3 projects work out well for both the public and private sector. Can Chen and John Bartle describe the successful Port Miami Tunnel project in a new policy white paper written for the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) and the Government Finance Officers Association ("Infrastructure Financing — A Guide for Local Government Managers," available from ICMA's Knowledge Network at http://icma.org/en/icma/knowledge_network). The tunnel opened in August 2014 and features a 35-year concession agreement, service-quality standards and milestone payments to the concessionaire during the construction period by the Florida Department of Transportation (DOT), in partnership with Miami-Dade County and the city of Miami. The tunnel will be returned to the Florida DOT in 2044.

This article was originally published by *Governing.com* at <http://www.governing.com/columns/smart-mgmt>.

Clearly, P3 projects can be a good way to leverage advanced technology and innovation in the private sector, and they have the potential to bring greater efficiency to an operation. On the other hand, complete project costs and risks often are not anticipated, and many do not factor in the range of equity issues related to service provision and fees. Some states and localities acknowledge the need for more staff and outside expertise to develop and manage P3s. Recognizing that some P3 projects pose a significant risk to public-sector entities — sometimes for decades — GFOA last year issued an advisory (available at www.gfoa.org) about exercising caution when considering a P3 arrangement.

As useful as P3s are, they still represent a small part of the infrastruc-

ture investment toolkit in the United States. Tax-exempt municipal bonds top the list, paying for everything from roads and bridges to schools, airports, water and wastewater projects, parks, sidewalks, infrastructure repairs, and public transportation. Between 2003 and 2014, states, counties, cities and other local governments invested \$3.5 trillion through municipal bonds, while the federal government provided \$1.46 trillion. And tax-exempt bonds are on a path to finance another \$2 trillion in infrastructure over the next 10 years. In all, debt financing accounts for 90 percent of state and local capital spending, according to a 2015 ICMA policy paper (“Municipal Bonds and Infrastructure Development — Past, Present, and Future,” also at http://icma.org/en/icma/knowledge_network).

None of this is to suggest that alternative financing tools shouldn’t have a place in the toolkit. It’s no secret that our investment in roads, water systems, and just about every other critical infrastructure priority has fallen behind in recent years. Having a reliable revenue stream to finance the most pressing projects is essential. But while P3s and other financing tools are welcome additions, they cannot replace the role of municipal bonds in financing public projects. ■

ELIZABETH K. KELLAR is senior fellow with the Center for State and Local Government Excellence and director of public policy for the International City/County Management Association.

Online Courses in Governmental Finance

If you are a steward of government funds, these self-paced online courses from the University of Georgia can enhance your value—and your career. All qualify for CEs/CPEs.

- Governmental Accounting
- Intro & Intermediate Budget
- Revenue Administration
- Debt Administration
- Capital Improvement Program
- Treasury Management
- Internal Controls
- Purchasing
- Human Resources For Government Officials


**CARL
VINSON INSTITUTE
OF GOVERNMENT**
The University of Georgia.

www.georgiacenter.uga.edu/govfinance/GFR



The University of Georgia
Center for Continuing Education

Units of the Office of Public Service & Outreach