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Why Pennsylvania?
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# A Long and Winding Road

Pennsylvania policy makers have long sought sustainable sources of revenue to support the state’s growing infrastructure needs. In recent years, two competing plans have generated contentious debate. One would lease the Pennsylvania Turnpike to a private consortium in exchange for a large, upfront payment, while the other would toll I-80, another key east-west route across the state, with permission from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Turnpike Commission proposes tolling I-80 as an alternative to leasing the Turnpike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Pennsylvania Turnpike opens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century is enacted, enabling states to collect tolls for reconstruction and rehabilitation on interstate highways if insufficient revenue is available to meet such needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>The Pennsylvania Transportation Funding Reform Commission reports that the state needs $17 billion in additional annual transportation funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>Governor Edward Rendell proposes a long-term concession of the Turnpike to help fill that funding gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The state solicits information from firms interested in leasing the Turnpike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Rendell sets an April 30 deadline for bid submissions, then extends it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Rendell announces support for a bill that would lease the Turnpike and repeal tolls on I-80.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 16</td>
<td>Rendell agrees to halt concession plans and support tolls on I-80.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>Rendell revives his plan to lease the Turnpike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
<td>The Turnpike Commission submits an application to toll I-80 to the FHWA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Abertis/Citi allow their offer to expire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>Three groups submit bids: Abertis/Citi, Goldman Sachs and Macquarie/Cintra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Macquarie/Cintra drops out of the running.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 19</td>
<td>Rendell announces Abertis/Citi’s $12.8 billion winning bid for a 75-year lease of the Turnpike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 26 and 27</td>
<td>The House Transportation Committee hears testimony from Abertis/Citi, the Turnpike Commission and others about the proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Research Questions

Proceed carefully in four main areas:

- The decision-making process
- The deal-making process
- The financial analysis
- Oversight and management of the partnership
What Went Right?

- Pennsylvania thoroughly identified its needs.
- The state conducted due diligence before negotiating with bidders.
- The bidding process was well run and produced the highest possible bid.
- Detailed performance standards were set for the life of the lease.
What Undermined the Deal?

- The Rendell Administration and many members of the legislature were often at odds.
- Enabling legislation was not in place.
- The financial assumptions related to the deal were overly optimistic.
- The state failed to articulate a specific plan for how the proceeds would have been invested and spent.
- The oversight structure was perceived as insufficient.
- A short-term perspective was applied to a proposal with significant long-term implications.
Lessons Learned

- States should enact enabling legislation before considering specific proposals.

- Transparency and inclusion are crucial to achieving buy-in from policy makers, the public and other stakeholders.

- Decision makers need a clear understanding of the principal goals of a deal.

- A proposed deal must be based on realistic financial assumptions.

- A proposal should describe how the revenues a lease will generate will be invested and spent, and how the private operator’s performance will be monitored.

- States should consider a long-term lease’s effects on the economy, the environment and future generations of taxpayers.
23 states (shaded) have enacted some sort of legislation to allow public-private partnerships for transportation.
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NOTE: Chicago has home-rule authority to lease its assets and as such did not need state legislation to lease the Chicago Skyway.
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Final Takeaways

- Public-private partnerships can’t be generalized as all good or all bad.

- These partnerships can supplement—but not substitute—public investment in infrastructure.

- The complexity and implications of these deals require that state policy makers be as well informed as possible as they pursue them.

- The better informed policy makers are, the better they will be able to continue protecting the public interest.
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