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Executive Summary

Purpose

- The Massachusetts P3 Oversight Commission (Commission) requested a high-level assessment of precedent P3 programs
- The purpose of this exercise is to better understand current and best practices in the government P3 project sponsor market, and to understand key themes, characteristics, and lessons learned
- Goals of the exercise include:
  - Assisting the Commission in identifying key next steps required to advance the P3 program and specific projects

Key Findings

- While the Commission is not responsible for the implementation of P3 projects, the authorizing legislation (Mass. Gen. Laws Ann. Ch. 6C, §62-73) provides an oversight mandate and empowers the Commission with significant approval authority
  - Specifically, the Commission will have to approve the RFP and the form and content of the contract with the private partner
- The Commission’s work can be facilitated with the development of comprehensive and transparent procedures and guidelines for P3 project assessment and approval within the framework of its authorizing legislation
- Significant coordination and collaboration will be required between the Commission, MassDOT, the Attorney General, Inspector General and the State Auditor, among others
- The Commission will be required to have a good understanding of project, political, policy, market, and stakeholder needs
- While the Commission’s structure and level of responsibility are relatively unique, the Commission will benefit from key lessons learned from many examples of successful P3 programs
What is the P3 program landscape in the US?
States in the US are increasingly looking to the P3 model as a viable alternative to infrastructure delivery.

Source: FHWA
# P3 Program Landscape
## US and International P3 Program Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established Programs</th>
<th>Emerging Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia</strong>&lt;br&gt;Office of Transportation for Public-Private Partnerships (OTP3)</td>
<td><strong>Pennsylvania</strong>&lt;br&gt;Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texas</strong>&lt;br&gt;Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)</td>
<td><strong>North Carolina</strong>&lt;br&gt;North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Florida</strong>&lt;br&gt;Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)</td>
<td><strong>Ohio</strong>&lt;br&gt;Division of Innovative Delivery, Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colorado</strong>&lt;br&gt;High Performance Transportation Enterprise</td>
<td><strong>Michigan</strong>&lt;br&gt;Office for P3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indiana</strong>&lt;br&gt;Indiana Department of Transportation (InDOT)</td>
<td><strong>Illinois</strong>&lt;br&gt;Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California</strong>&lt;br&gt;California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)</td>
<td><strong>Maryland</strong>&lt;br&gt;Transportation P3 Program (TP3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Puerto Rico</strong>&lt;br&gt;Public-Private Partnerships Authority (PPPA)</td>
<td><strong>Alaska</strong>&lt;br&gt;Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority (KABATA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontario, Canada</strong>&lt;br&gt;Infrastructure Ontario</td>
<td><strong>Arizona</strong>&lt;br&gt;Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>British Columbia, Canada</strong>&lt;br&gt;Partnerships BC</td>
<td><strong>Nevada</strong>&lt;br&gt;Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Kingdom</strong>&lt;br&gt;Partnerships UK</td>
<td><strong>New York/New Jersey</strong>&lt;br&gt;Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia</strong>&lt;br&gt;Infrastructure Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria, Australia</strong>&lt;br&gt;Partnerships Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do MassDOT and the Commission fit into the North American P3 program landscape?
Established under the Massachusetts Transportation Reform Act of 2009

There are 7 members, including:
- 4 appointed by Governor
- 1 appointed by Senate president
- 1 appointed by House speaker
- 1 appointed by State Treasurer

Membership served in 2-year terms
- Gubernatorial members eligible for reappointment (limited to 3 terms)

Staff for research, analysis and support to be provided by MassDOT (or the Department)

Commission expertise must include:
- Transportation
- Public policy
- Public finance
- Law
- Engineering/Science
- Management consulting
- Transportation or organizational change

Points of Reference: Virginia, Partnerships BC, Infrastructure Ontario

Massachusetts P3 Overview

Commission Responsibilities*

**Written approval of RFPs:**
- Written approval of Commission required for all P3 RFPs
- RFP must contain form of P3 agreement/contract
- Commission must approve form and content of P3 agreement/contract

**Issue report on findings to:**
- Secretary of Administration and Finance
- House Committee on Ways and Means
- Senate Committee on Ways and Means
- Chairman of the Joint Committee on Transportation
- State Auditor

- Inspector General and the Attorney General must provide Commission with written notification of material objections to P3 agreement/contract within 30 days
- Commission must provide initial written response on draft RFP to MassDOT within 15 days of receipt
- MassDOT must provide Commission with written response regarding reason for any substantial divergence from recommendations
- Commission must issue report within 30 days of approval
- No material changes may be made to the content or form of the P3 agreement/contract by MassDOT or the preferred bidder
- The State Auditor may issue a report concluding that the RFP is financially detrimental to the Commonwealth

---

*Mass. Gen. Laws Ann. Ch. 6C, §§64 & 73*
The Commission must comment on and report on the following issues as they relate to a specific RFP:

Current employees
Policy, legislative and regulatory structure
Taxation, profit sharing and revenue generation
Advertising and marketing
New technology
Financial evaluation
Advantages of a P3
Allocation of responsibility
Lease and termination terms

Points of Reference: Infrastructure Ontario, Partnerships BC, Virginia, Pennsylvania

*Mass. Gen. Laws Ann. Ch. 6C, §73*
Massachusetts P3 Overview

**MassDOT P3 Procurement Process***

- DBFOM/DBFM solicitations by competitive, sealed bids
- Department has ability to:
  - Undertake 2-step procurements and prequalify bidders through RFQ process
  - Short-list proposers
  - Pay stipends to proposers
  - Engage in discussions with proposers
  - Make selection of preferred bidder based on factors determined to be most advantageous (includes price and other evaluation criteria established in the RFP)
  - State relative importance of key proposal characteristics
  - Maintain confidentiality of proposers for proprietary information
  - Provide adequate public notice
- RFP must contain form of P3 contract/agreement
- Inspector General and Attorney General must notify the Commission within 30 days of any material objections to the contract and the Department must respond prior to issuance of RFP

**Points of Reference: Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Virginia, Texas**

*Mass. Gen. Laws Ann. Ch. 6C, §63-64*
Massachusetts P3 Overview

MassDOT Additional P3 Statutory Authorizations*

- Department may issue and sell bonds for P3 projects:
  - To be corporate obligations of the Department
  - Will not constitute debt of the Commonwealth nor be a pledge of faith and credit
  - Debt service payable from:
    - Project revenue
    - Bond proceeds
    - Investment earnings
    - Other funds available to the Department

- Private Activity Bonds (PABs) can be used by private partner

- Federal funding and agreements can be used by the Department for a project

- Private funding or property may be contributed

- Combination of federal, state, local and private funding can be combined to fund a project

- Eminent domain may be used by the Department/Commonwealth to secure Right-of-Way

- Prevailing wage requirements must be met

Points of Reference: Indiana, Virginia, Colorado

Massachusetts P3 Overview
Potential Areas for Clarification

- **Legal**
  - Additional clarity may be required for:
    - Unsolicited proposals process
    - Use of availability payment models

- **Funding**
  - Can other forms of Commonwealth funds be used to support a project either upfront or over time
  - Use of state appropriation funding

- **Structure and Coordination with Other Stakeholders**
  - Bylaws and program guidelines
  - Interaction with Attorney General and Inspector General
  - Role of the State Auditor
  - Stakeholder coordination plan (FHWA, MPOs, etc)
  - Allocation of MassDOT staff for Commission support
How does Massachusetts compare to other successful P3 programs throughout the US?
# P3 Program Comparison
## Key Themes Summary Matrix

How does Massachusetts compare to other successful P3 programs throughout the US?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Virginia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MassDOT: Implement and execute</td>
<td>FDOT: Implement and execute</td>
<td>TxDOT: Implement and execute</td>
<td>OTP3: Recommend and implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval requirements</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Virginia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission (RFP and P3 Agreement form and content)</td>
<td>MassDOT: Implement and execute</td>
<td>FDOT: Implement and execute</td>
<td>TxDOT: Implement and execute</td>
<td>OTP3: Recommend and implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor and legislators (pre-procurement)</td>
<td>MassDOT: Implement and execute</td>
<td>FDOT: Implement and execute</td>
<td>TxDOT: Implement and execute</td>
<td>OTP3: Recommend and implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General (concession agreement)</td>
<td>MassDOT: Implement and execute</td>
<td>FDOT: Implement and execute</td>
<td>TxDOT: Implement and execute</td>
<td>OTP3: Recommend and implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting requirements</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Virginia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MassDOT</td>
<td>FDOT</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>OTP3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 Oversight Commission</td>
<td>FDOT</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>OTP3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established policies / procedures</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Virginia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>No published guidelines</td>
<td>No published guidelines</td>
<td>Yes: PPTA Implementation Manual and Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorizing statute guidance</td>
<td>Authorizing statute guidance</td>
<td>Authorizing statute guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location and dedication of office</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Virginia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3 program legislatively authorized as a function of MassDOT</td>
<td>Project Finance Office – under Comptroller’s office within FDOT</td>
<td>Strategic Projects Division – division within TxDOT</td>
<td>OTP3 – dedicated P3 office within VDOT</td>
<td>Direct reporting to Secretary of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dedicated P3 office or division at this time</td>
<td>Dedicated to project finance</td>
<td>Not fully dedicated to P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated to project finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time / part-time staff</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Virginia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MassDOT employees TBD</td>
<td>Full-time staff</td>
<td>Leverage TxDOT staff</td>
<td>Full-time staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated to project finance</td>
<td>Not fully dedicated to P3</td>
<td>Dedicated to P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of outside consultants</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Virginia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How does Massachusetts compare to other successful P3 programs throughout the US?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Identification and Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparent evaluation criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsolicited proposals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project pipeline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market outreach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stipends</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the key themes or characteristics when developing a successful P3 program?
Establish clear framework for decision making to ensure that projects with the right level of support are taken to market

Important to keep in mind…

- Clear authority and mission statement
- Sector focus
- Established policies and procedures
- Goals and objectives
- Identification of relevant stakeholders
- Decision making hierarchy
- Approval requirements
- Reporting requirements
- Steering committee

P3 Programs that successfully illustrate key themes and characteristics:

**Virginia OTP3**
- Singular sector focus, multi-modal transportation
- Comprehensive policy and procedures guidelines
- P3 Steering committee
- Clear approval structure

**Puerto Rico PPPA**
- P3 Committee established for each project and responsible for:
  - Project evaluation and selection
  - Establishing terms and conditions of P3 contract
  - Reporting on process and procedures

**TxDOT**
- P3 Comprehensive policy and procedures guidelines
- P3 Steering committee
- Approval authority with Texas Transportation Commission
- Senate Bill 1420 Committee
Key Themes
Organization

Ensure that appropriate resources are available to successfully deliver under your mandate

Important to keep in mind…
- Location and dedication of office
- Full-time/part-time staff
- Use of outside consultants
  - Technical
  - Legal
  - Financial/commercial
- Training and experience of staff
- Dedicated project management
- Compensation
- Oversight, transparency and accountability
- Funding
- Budgeting and administration

P3 Programs that successfully illustrate key themes and characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virginia OTP3</th>
<th>TxDOT</th>
<th>Infrastructure Ontario (Canada)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Independent office under Secretary of Transportation</td>
<td>▪ Strategic Projects Division – division within TxDOT</td>
<td>▪ Structured as a Crown corporation (government-owned corporation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Small staff of full-time dedicated project managers</td>
<td>▪ Leverage TxDOT staff</td>
<td>▪ 100+ dedicated, full-time professional staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ 100% state funded</td>
<td>▪ Office/staff not fully dedicated to P3</td>
<td>▪ Funded primarily by fee-for-service and management fee arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Broad use of outside consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Themes
Project Identification and Selection

Develop an evaluation process to ensure appropriate and marketable projects are selected for P3 solicitation

Important to keep in mind…
- Identify candidate projects
- Establish transparent evaluation criteria
  - Qualitative and quantitative
- Unsolicited proposals
  - Proposal review fee
  - Competitive process
- Project screening
  - Value for Money
  - Ability to transfer risk
  - Technical, environmental and financial feasibility
- Prioritization
- Pathfinder project

P3 Programs that successfully illustrate key themes and characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virginia OTP3</th>
<th>PennDOT</th>
<th>Puerto Rico PPPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documented approach to project identification/screening/selection</td>
<td>Documented approach to project identification/screening/selection however not yet implemented</td>
<td>PPPA administers consistent methodology for evaluating P3 candidate projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used unsolicited proposal to initiate program</td>
<td>Unsolicited proposals accepted during limited window</td>
<td>Required approach for detailed business case development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publically available project pipeline</td>
<td>Pathfinder project</td>
<td>Benefit-Cost Analysis required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorialized VfM guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Themes

Project Development

Maximize market interest in your project/program and increase competition among bidders

Important to keep in mind…

- Project pipeline
- Market outreach
  - RFI
  - Industry day
  - Market soundings
- One-on-one meetings
- Stakeholder coordination
- Federal funding applications
- Stipends
- Manageable procurement schedule
- Informed negotiations
- De-politicized process

P3 Programs that successfully illustrate key themes and characteristics:

**Colorado HPTE**
- Hosted an industry day to introduce the new agency, project pipeline and pathfinder project to market
- Significant stakeholder interaction
- Conducted extensive one-on-one meetings with market participants

**InDOT**
- Conducted market soundings
- Hosted project industry day
- Conducted extensive one-on-one meetings with market participants
- Strong political champion for ORB

**OTP3**
- Strong project pipeline
- Governor holds annual transportation conference focused on major projects
- Specific market outreach performed on a project-by-project basis
What are the next steps needed to advance the MassDOT P3 Program?
Next Steps
Information Requirements for the Commission

A business case template can be developed to capture and address your mandated reporting requirements

Information Requirements

Based on reporting requirements, may include:

- Explanation of need
- Cost information (capital, maintenance, lifecycle)
- Demand and revenue projections (if applicable)
- Scope options
- Risk assessment
- Value for Money analysis
- Funding and financing options analysis
- Delivery model options analysis
- Business terms
- Benchmark of commercial terms
- RFQ/RFP/P3 agreement precedents
- Explanation for deviations from market precedents
- Benefit cost analysis
Next Steps

Commission Considerations

- Develop comprehensive P3 program guidelines
  - Establish decision-making process
  - Project identification/screening/prioritization
  - Business case template (Value for Money)
  - Procurement process
  - Document information needed for decision making

- Commercial considerations
  - Review of RFQ/RFP/P3 agreement precedents
  - Workshop on procurement documents and commercial terms
  - Benchmarking of commercial terms

- Consider organizational needs and requirements
  - Staffing
  - Outside advisory consultants (T&R, engineering, financial, legal)
  - Training
  - Sub-committees
  - Steering committees
Appendix
Appendix

Detailed Case Studies

- Virginia Office of Transportation P3s
- Texas Department of Transportation
- Florida Department of Transportation
- Infrastructure Ontario
- Partnerships BC
- Partnerships UK
## Virginia Office of Transportation P3s (OTP3)

### Entity Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entity Description</strong></td>
<td>Centralized P3 agency for the Commonwealth of Virginia, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission Statement</strong></td>
<td>To ensure that Public Private Partnership Transportation Act (PPTA) projects are consistent with the Commonwealth’s transportation goals of improving safety and security; reducing congestion; system maintenance and preservation; mobility, connectivity, and accessibility; environmental stewardship; economic vitality; and coordination of transportation and land use and program delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Organization Goals**    | Facilitate timely delivery of PPTA projects within established laws and regulations  
|                           | Develop multimodal and intermodal solutions consistent with state, regional and local policies, plans and programs  
|                           | Encourage competition for innovation and private sector investment creating value-for-money for the commonwealth  
|                           | Promote transparency, accountability, informed and timely decision making  
|                           | Establish reliable and uniform processes and procedures to encourage private sector investment  
|                           | Seek efficiencies by standardizing processes  
|                           | Foster efficient management of commonwealth financial and organizational resources  
|                           | Achieve lifecycle cost efficiencies through appropriate risk transfer  
|                           | Promote economic growth and job creation |
| **Roles and Responsibilities** | OTP3 is responsible for developing and implementing a statewide program for project delivery under the PPTA of 1995  
|                           | OTP3 provides day-to-day hands-on project management, leadership and strategic/policy/commercial/business interest representation for the Commonwealth of Virginia on potential and active P3 projects |

---

1Virginia Office of Transportation Public–Private Partnerships
# Virginia Office of Transportation P3s (OTP3)

## Key Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislative Authorization</strong>&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Enabling legislation: Public-Private Transportation Act of 1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Structure and Governance**<sup>2</sup> | - Public office within the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)  
- OTP3 Director reports to the Commissioner of VDOT  
- Works in coordination with the Secretary of Transportation and the Commonwealth’s seven transportation agencies  
- Administrative support provided by VDOT  
- Oversight Boards – Commonwealth Transportation Board, Virginia Aviation Board, Virginia Port Authority Board of Commissioners  
- PPTA Steering Committee |
| **Organizational Location**<sup>3</sup> | - Public office established within VDOT  
- Direct reporting to Secretary of Transportation |
| **Approval Requirements**<sup>4</sup> | - PPTA Steering Committee  
- Commonwealth Transportation Board (Gubernatorial appointment) |
| **Funding Model**<sup>5</sup> | - State funded  
- No transaction fee |
| **Staffing Model**<sup>6</sup> | - Focused professional team of multi-disciplinary in-house staff including six program managers  
- In-house staffing augmented by outside legal, financial, technical business consultants |

---

<sup>1</sup> Virginia Office of Transportation Public – Private Partnerships  
<sup>2</sup> Public-Private Transportation Act of 1995
## Virginia Office of Transportation P3s (OTP3)

### Key Characteristics (Cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Standardized Policies and Procedures**<sup>2</sup> | - PPTA Implementation Manual and Guidelines:  
  - Amended May 21, 2012  
  - Provides guidance regarding PPTA legal, organization, reporting and funding framework  
  - Provides guidance on project identification, screening, development and implementation for both solicited PPTA projects and unsolicited proposals across all modes of transportation, including multi-modal and intermodal projects  
  - Provides guidance on the procurement and proposal submissions process, proposal evaluation criteria, and PPTA audit requirements |
| **Sector Coverage**<sup>2</sup> | - Multi-modal transportation |
| **Solicited / Unsolicited Policy**<sup>2</sup> | - Unsolicited proposals are accepted  
  - $50,000 proposal review fee: non-refundable, non-negotiable  
  - PPTA Implementation Manual and Guidelines provide explicit direction on the framework to be utilized for project identification, screening and prioritization, development and procurement for both methods |

<sup>2</sup>Public-Private Transportation Act of 1995
Virginia Office of Transportation P3s (OTP3)

### Key Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Closed Transactions       | ▪ Route 460 Corridor Improvements  
                          | ▪ I-95 Express Lanes  
                          | ▪ Downtown Tunnel/Midtown Tunnel/MLK Extension  
                          | ▪ Capital Beltway Express Lanes (I-495)  
                          | ▪ Dulles Rail  
                          | ▪ Route 895 Pocahontas Parkway  
                          | ▪ Coalfields Expressway |
| Total Dollar Value of Closed Transactions | ▪ $10 billion + |
| Ongoing Transactions     | ▪ Regional Traffic Operations Centers  
                          | ▪ Hampton Roads Bridge Tunnel  
                          | ▪ I-66 Managed Lanes |
| Projects in Pipeline 3    | ▪ Approximately 10 projects in current pipeline  
                          | ▪ Project pipeline is publicly available on the web |

3Virginia Office of Transportation Public – Private Partnerships
## Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)

### Entity Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entity Description</strong>&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- The Strategic Projects Division under the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission Statement</strong>&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- TxDOT mission statement is to work with others to provide safe and reliable transportation solutions for Texas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Organization Goals**<sup>3,4</sup> | - TxDOT’s goals are to maintain a safe system, address congestion, connect Texas communities, and become a best-in-class state agency  
- The Strategic Project Division’s goals are to adopt rules, procedures, guidelines and negotiations to promote fairness, obtain private participants in projects, and promote confidence among those participants |
| **Roles and Responsibilities**<sup>3</sup> | - Oversees procurement policies, rights of way acquisition, support activities for P3 agreements Comprehensive Development Agreements (CDAs), turnpike corridor system planning, toll feasibility planning and coordination of Regional Mobility Authorities  
- Completes feasibility studies of candidate CDA projects and assists TxDOT districts |

---

<sup>3</sup>Texas Department of Transportation  
<sup>4</sup>Texas Transportation Code
Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)

Key Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislative Authorization</strong>&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Enabling legislation for TxDOT to enter into CDAs: Chapter 223 of the Texas Transportation Code (roads and highways)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Structure and Governance**<sup>3</sup> | - TxDOT is governed by the five-member Texas Transportation Commission and an executive director selected by the Commission  
- The Strategic Projects Division works in coordination with Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Regional Mobility Authorities and local cities and counties |
| **Organizational Location**<sup>3</sup> | - Established under the Texas Department of Transportation |
| **Approval Requirements**<sup>4</sup> | - A contract must be: made in the name of the state, signed by the director or the director’s designee, approved by at least two members of the Commission, and signed by the successful bidder |
| **Funding Model**<sup>3</sup> | - State and federally funded |
| **Staffing Model**<sup>3</sup> | - The Strategic Projects Division has a team of employees, as well as a director overseeing the division  
- May leverage professional and consulting services |

<sup>3</sup>Texas Department of Transportation

<sup>4</sup>Texas Transportation Code
### Key Characteristics (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Standardized Policies and Procedures**<sup>4</sup> | - The Texas Transportation Code Chapter 223 outlines the statutory framework and procedures for CDAs, including:  
  - Description of authority, department obligations, and limitations on financial participation  
  - Provides guidance on the process, project identification, screening, development and implementation for both solicited projects and unsolicited proposals related to CDAs |
| **Sector Coverage**<sup>4, 5</sup> | - TxDOT’s mandate allows for roads, highways, and rail |
| **Solicited / Unsolicited Policy**<sup>4</sup> | - The department may accept unsolicited proposals for a proposed project or solicit proposals  
  - The department shall establish rules and procedures for accepting unsolicited proposals requiring certain information from the private entity  
  - The department may require that an unsolicited proposal be accompanied by a $5,000 nonrefundable fee sufficient to cover all or part of its cost to review the proposal |

---

<sup>4</sup>Texas Transportation Code  
<sup>5</sup>Texas Facilities Commission
# Key Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Closed Transactions ²      | - IH 35E Manages Lanes (DB)  
  - SH 99/Grand Parkway (DB)  
  - Horseshoe Project (DB)  
  - DFW Connector (DB)  
  - LBJ 635 (Concession)  
  - North Tarrant Express (Two separate concessions)  
  - SH 130 (Segment 5 & 6) (Concession)  
  - SH 130 (CTTS) (DB) |
| Total Dollar Value of Closed Transactions ² | $12 billion + |
| Ongoing Transactions ²     | - Loop 1604 Western Expansion  
  - SH 183 Managed Lanes  
  - SH 288 Harris County  
  - US 77 Upgrade (Kingsville to Driscoll)  
  - Grand Parkway |
| Projects in Pipeline ²     | Project pipeline is publically available |

²Texas Department of Transportation
## Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)
### Entity Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entity Description</strong>&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Division of the Florida Office of Comptroller in the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission Statement</strong>&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- The Project Finance Office provides strategic financial solutions, analysis and reporting that ensures the advancement of transportation projects and consistency and accountability for the Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Organization Goals**<sup>6</sup> | - Serve internal and external customers with innovative, timely financial solutions  
- Maintain a customer-driven mentality  
- Uphold integrity and seek innovation to the benefit of the people of Florida |
| **Roles and Responsibilities**<sup>6</sup> | - Provides support, coordination and oversight in the areas of P3s, the State Infrastructure Bank, and Toll Finance and Facilities  
- Responsible for overseeing the application and approval process for solicited and unsolicited proposals while ensuring regulations stated in Florida legislation are followed |

<sup>6</sup>Florida Department of Transportation
## Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)

### Key Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislative Authorization</strong>&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Enabling legislation: 2013 Florida Statutes, Title XXVI, Chapter 334, Section 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Structure and Governance**<sup>6</sup> | - Project Finance Division in FDOT  
- FDOT is an executive agency, which means it reports directly to the Governor  
- Decentralized agency structure |
| **Organizational Location**<sup>6</sup> | - Division of the Office of Comptroller |
| **Approval Requirements**<sup>8</sup> | - Department may proceed with a project upon approval of the Governor  
  - If the chair of either legislative appropriations committee, the President of the Senate, or the Speaker of the House of Representatives objects to the proposed project in writing within 14 days after receipt of the summary, the Governor may not approve the project |
| **Funding Model**<sup>7</sup> | - No state funding for projects unless the project is on the State Highway System  
- No more than 15% of total federal and state funding for the State Transportation Fund shall be obligated for projects |
| **Staffing Model**<sup>7</sup> | - There is a Project Finance Office Manager that oversees the P3 program  
- Department may engage the use of private consultants to assist in the valuation |

<sup>6</sup>Florida Department of Transportation  
<sup>7</sup>The Florida Senate  
<sup>8</sup>The National Conference of State Legislatures
### Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)

**Key Characteristics (Cont'd)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Standardized Policies and Procedures**<sup>7</sup> | ▪ 2013 Florida Statutes, Title XXVI, Chapter 334, Section 30  
  – Provides guidance regarding proposal acceptance guidelines  
  – Provides guidance on range of projects with which the Division can become involved  
  – Outlines the types of funding that can be utilized  
  ▪ 2013 Florida Statutes, Title XXVI, Chapter 339, Section 2825  
  – Outlines the formal approval process once the Office decides to proceed with the project |
| **Sector Coverage**<sup>7</sup> | ▪ Multi-modal transportation facilities |
| **Solicited / Unsolicited Policy**<sup>7</sup> | ▪ Both solicited and unsolicited proposals are accepted  
  – $50,000 proposal review fee |

<sup>7</sup>The Florida Senate
Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)

Key Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closed Transactions</strong></td>
<td>▪ SR 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ I-75 North of SR 80 to South of SR78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ SR 9B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ I-95 from South of SR 406 to North of SR 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ I-4 Connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Palmetto Section 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ US 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Port of Miami Tunnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ I-595 Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Palmetto Expressway Widening and Interchange Improvements Section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ US 1 Improvements in the “18-Mile Stretch”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ I-95 Widening/Pineda Causeway Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ I-95 Express Lanes Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ I-75 in Lee and Collier Counties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total Dollar Value of Closed Transactions** | ▪ $4.4 billion (aggregate of 14 projects above) |

| **Ongoing Transactions** | ▪ I-4 Ultimate in Orange & Seminole Counties |
|                         | ▪ First Coast Outer Beltway |
|                         | ▪ Miami-Orlando Passenger Rail Line |
|                         | ▪ FL54 Xpressway |

| **Projects in Pipeline** | ▪ None available |

---
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## Infrastructure Ontario (IO)

### Entity Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entity Description</strong></td>
<td>▪ Wholly owned crown corporation by the Province of Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission Statement</strong></td>
<td>▪ To be recognized as world class in the modernization of public services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Organization Goals**    | ▪ Continue to procure assigned projects on time, on budget, and on scope.  
                             ▪ Ensure projects that begin construction are built on time, on budget, and on scope  
                             ▪ Support infrastructure investment across the broader public sector  
                             ▪ Pay keen attention to meeting the clients’ expectations and strive to improve client service  
                             ▪ Achieve the financial and business targets for the organization. Success on the ground must be matched by the strength of IO’s finances  
                             ▪ Maintain momentum by continuously improving and adapting IO’s strategies and programs to overcome new challenges and support new government priorities |
| **Roles and Responsibilities** | ▪ Project delivery: manage the planning, design and delivery of major public infrastructure projects  
                             ▪ Project development: develop and plan potential AFP projects  
                             ▪ Infrastructure lending: responsible for IO’s Loan Program, which provides public sector entities with access to low cost loans to build and renew local public infrastructure  
                             ▪ Human resources and technology: develop the internal strength to meet IO’s needs in IT and personnel  
                             ▪ Shared services: provide project delivery and corporate services to the entire organization including legal, finance, communications and corporate relations responsibilities  
                             ▪ Special initiatives: advise government on how to generate new forms of capital |

---

1. *Infrastructure Ontario*
2. *Infrastructure Ontario Annual Report 2009-2010*
## Key Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Authorization</td>
<td>- Ontario Infrastructure and Lands Corporation Act (2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Structure and Governance | - Crown corporation without share capital  
- Classified by the Province of Ontario as an Operational Enterprise  
- Chair and CEO are designated and appointed, respectively, by the Lieutenant Governor in Council to ensure IO’s activities are compliant with relevant statutes and government directives |
| Organizational Location   | - Established under the Ministry of Infrastructure  
- Accountable / report to the Minister of Infrastructure                                                                |
| Approval Requirements     | - Approval required from the Minister of Infrastructure                                                                                                |
| Funding Model             | - IO is dependent on the Province of Ontario for the provision of funds to cover operating costs, finance project costs until recovery and to support the concessionary loans provided to municipalities  
- Province of Ontario is committed to multi-year infrastructure projects and has provided a fifty-year loan to fund IO  
- IO’s primary sources of revenue: project delivery fees, management fees, recoverable costs and funding appropriation |
| Staffing Model            | - Composed of 11 Board of Directors (BOD) appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister, 7 senior management team members and full-time staff of over 450 employees  
- Term not to exceed three years and BOD may be reappointed for successive terms not exceeding three years each  
- Outside advisors may be leveraged on some projects, however generally less reliance due to internal staff resources |

**Notes:**
- Infrastructure Ontario
- Infrastructure Ontario Annual Report 2011-2012
## Infrastructure Ontario (IO)
### Key Characteristics (Cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Standardized Policies and Procedures**<sup>10</sup> | - Ontario Infrastructure and Lands Corporation Act (2011)  
  — Provides guidance surrounding the status, powers, limitations, staffing, policies and responsibilities of the Corporation  
- The Vendor Performance Program  
  — Outlines guidance to monitor the performance of vendors within IO’s supply chain in order to ensure the responsible management of IO contracts and enhancement of the value of public sector real estate and services |
| **Sector Coverage**<sup>10</sup> | - Projects (Roads, highways, bridges, public transit, hospitals, courthouses)  
- Loan Program – Long-term financing to eligible public sector clients  
- Buildings – Asset management, Realty services, Client program delivery  
- Lands – Portfolio planning, Sales & Acquisitions |
| **Solicited / Unsolicited Policy**<sup>10</sup> | - IO is committed to an open, fair and competitive procurement process  
- IO does not accept unsolicited proposals  
- IO procures primarily in two ways:  
  — Via public open procurement  
  — From a vendor of record list |

<sup>10</sup>Infrastructure Ontario
## Infrastructure Ontario (IO)

### Key Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Closed Transactions**    | ▪ 407-ER Toronto Highway Eastward Extension P3  
▪ Windsor-Essex Parkway AFP  
▪ New Oakville Hospital P3  
▪ Pan/Parapan American Games Athletes Village P3  
▪ Ottawa Light Rail Transit – Confederation Line Financing  
▪ St. Joseph’s Regional Mental Health Care P3  
▪ Bridgepoint Hospital P3  
▪ Toronto Forensic Services and Coroner’s Complex P3  
▪ Toronto South Detention Centre P3  
▪ Niagara Health System St Catharines P3 |
| **Total Dollar Value of Closed Transactions** | $7 billion + (aggregate total of the transactions above) |
| **Ongoing Transactions**   | ▪ Humber College Institute of Technology & Advanced Learning  
▪ New St. Michael’s Hospital |
| **Projects in Pipeline**   | There are 7 projects in the pipeline |

9Infrastructure Journal  
10Infrastructure Ontario
## Entity Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Entity Description**    | ▪ Registered company under the British Columbia Business Corporations Act  
                            ▪ Wholly owned by the Province of British Columbia  
                            ▪ Reports to its sole shareholder, the Minister of Finance |
| **Mission Statement**     | ▪ PBC’s vision is to be a recognized leader in evaluating, structuring and implementing partnership delivery solutions for public infrastructure which achieve value for money.  
                            ▪ The Company is focused on delivering consistent value to its clients and is committed to its long-term viability |
| **Organization Goals**    | ▪ Maintain focus on providing core services from planning through operations phase  
                            ▪ Continue applying expertise to large or complex projects  
                            ▪ Diversify business with new clients and new sectors  
                            ▪ Support clients in the area of capital program planning and project governance  
                            ▪ Engage with key stakeholders in the business community and market to generate awareness, support and understanding for major project benefits and delivery methods |
| **Roles and Responsibilities** | ▪ Plan and structure partnership delivery solutions for public infrastructure that are expected to achieve value for money  
                              ▪ Successfully implement partnership delivery solutions for public infrastructure through leadership in procurement, practices, and market development  
                              ▪ Maintain a self-sustaining organization and provide added value to an increasingly diverse client base |

---

13Partnerships BC
## Partnerships British Columbia (PBC)  
### Key Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Authorization</td>
<td>British Columbia Business Corporations Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Structure and Governance  | Crown Authority composed of Board of Directors and a Management Team  
|                           | The members of the Board of Directors are appointed and the Lieutenant Governor in Council determines term length |
| Organizational Location   | Established under Business Corporations Act and reports to the Minister of Finance |
| Approval Requirements     | The Ministry of Finance is the oversight entity and sole shareholder  
|                           | On an annual basis, the Board reviews the performance measures and provides recommendations for change, if necessary  
|                           | The management team presents an operations report to the Board each quarter, tracks progress and takes corrective action |
| Funding Model             | Fee for service structure in which the organization provides services directly through its own expertise and also by engaging external consultants where specialized advice is required |
| Staffing Model            | Composed of seven Board of Directors, four senior management team members and 37 full-time staff in FY 2011 - 2012  
|                           | The Board Chair and the President and Chief Executive Officer meet with the Shareholder on key matters  
|                           | The Board is supported by two committees: the Audit and Risk Management Committee and the Human Resources and Governance Committee  
|                           | Outside advisors may be leveraged on some projects, however generally less reliance due to internal staff resources |

13Partnerships BC  
14Partnerships BC Annual Report 2011-2012
### Part 2: Characteristics of PBC Program Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Standardized Policies and Procedures**<sup>13</sup> | - Government’s Letter of Expectation:  
- Provides the Government’s annual direction to PBC and is an agreement on the parties’ respective accountabilities, roles and responsibilities  
- The Letter confirms PBC’s mandate and priority actions, articulates the key performance expectations and forms the basis for the development of the Service Plan and Annual Service Plan Report  
- “Best Practice Guidelines” as published in the “Governance and Disclosure Guidelines for Governing Boards of British Columbia Public Sector Organizations”:  
  - Provides governance practices, as well as terms of reference for the Board, its committees and directors |
| **Sector Coverage**<sup>13</sup> | Mandate allows for projects in the transportation, health, energy, public housing, corrections and wastewater sectors |
| **Solicited / Unsolicited Policy**<sup>13</sup> | - Solicited and unsolicited proposals accepted  
- The tender process is more collaborative compared with other centralized procuring authorities |

<sup>13</sup>Partnerships BC
### Characteristics / Criteria | Program Description
--- | ---
#### Closed Transactions 13
- Evergreen Line Rapid Transit Project
- Interior Heart and Surgical Centre (IHSC) Project
- Kitsilano Secondary School Renewal
- Lakes District Hospital/Health Centre Replacement
- Oak Bay High School Replacement Project
- Port Man/Highway 1 Improvement Project
- Queen Charlotte/Haida Gwaii Hospital Replacement
- Smart Metering Program
- South Fraser Perimeter Road Project
- SRO Renewal Initiative
- Surrey Pretrial Services Centre Expansion Project
- Wood Innovation and Design Centre Project
- Pitt River Bridge & Mary Hill Interchange
- Royal Jubilee Hospital Patient Care Centre
- Sierra Yoyou Desan Road
- Sea-to-Sky Highway
- Vancouver Island Health Authority (VIHA) Residential Care & Assisted Living Residential Care
- William R. Bennet Bridge
- Britannia Mine Water Treatment Plant
- Canada Line
- Ford St. John Hospital Project
- Golden Ears Bridge
- Abbotsford Regional Hospital and Cancer Centre

#### Total Dollar Value of Closed Transactions 14
- Since 2002, PBC has participated in more than 35 projects with an investment value of approximately $12.5 billion

#### Ongoing Transactions 15
- BC Children’s and BC Women’s Redevelopment Project
- Vernon Jubilee Hospital Inpatient Beds Project
- Emily Carr University of Art + Design Redevelopment Project
- John Hart Generating Station Replacement Project
- North Island Hospital Project
- Okanagan Correctional Centre Project
- Royal Inland Hospital Clinical Services Building Project
- City of Surrey Biofuel Processing Facility Project
- Capital Regional District: McLaughlin Wastewater Treatment Plant Project

#### Projects in Pipeline 15
- Approximately 7 projects in current pipeline

---
13Partnerships BC
14Partnerships BC Annual Report 2011-2012
15Inspirata
### Entity Overview

#### Characteristic / Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity Description</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships UK PLC (PUK) was an organization responsible for furthering P3s in the UK</td>
<td>- A public limited company formed in 2000, owned jointly by HM Treasury and the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PUK ceased to exist in May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some PUK assets, services, data, and staff moved to IUK (Infrastructure United Kingdom) and Local Partnerships (a joint venture between PUK and the Local Government Association), with other assets being sold during 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The IUK is a unit of the treasury department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PUK was a 50% partner in Partnerships for Schools and pioneered Partnerships for Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mission Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Statement</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To assist governments (local, municipal, regional, national, devolved, supreme, state, or federal) and other public bodies in the UK and elsewhere in the development, procurement, financing, management and implementation of public private partnership projects (projects and undertakings the resources for which are provided partly by public bodies and private persons) by entering into joint ventures, by participating in public private partnership projects with private persons or by acting as an investor, consultant or otherwise, and to promote the development and use of public private partnerships generally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Organization Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Goals</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work as a co-sponsor on specific P3 projects</td>
<td>- Make equity investments in wider market projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide support to central and local government and other public bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Offer on-balance sheet loan products for P3 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Make investments in new initiatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles and Responsibilities</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUK has two main roles: regulatory and project review; mandated by Treasury</td>
<td>- Responsible for reviewing value-for-money assessments, affordability, project governance and management, stakeholder support, bankability, level of commercial interest and adherence to standard contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PUK’s other main role was project, program and policy support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

16Partnerships UK
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## Partnerships UK (PUK)
### Key Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislative Authorization</strong>&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Infrastructure New Approach to P3s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Structure and Governance**<sup>17</sup> | - Public limited company / State Authority (51% private, 49% public)  
- The principal driver for this structure was to create a platform within government to attract and retain good commercial skills and other types of skills from the public and the private sectors  
- The roles of the private sector shareholders were restricted |
| **Organizational Location**<sup>17</sup> | - Public limited company owned jointly by HM Treasury and the private sector |
| **Approval Requirements**<sup>16</sup> | - The Advisory council of 20 members was created by the HM Treasury to oversee the work of PUK  
- The Council consisted exclusively of members from the public sector and met twice a year  
- The Advisory Council did not have any executive authority over PUK, however, the Directors reviewed the conclusions of the Advisory Council |
| **Funding Model**<sup>17</sup> | - PUK received government funding, however, PUK was primarily funded on a fee-for-service basis, paid by the public service agency or department that used its services  
- The fee was based on the amount of time spent by PUK on a certain project and was essentially a per-diem or daily rate agreed on a framework basis across government  
- Some funding also came from overseas governments, who paid to have PUK assist with their PPP projects and agencies |
| **Staffing Model**<sup>17</sup> | - PUK had a Board of Directors which consisted of 11 members which were appointed to oversee the organization  
- Over 50 staff that were hired primarily from the private sector |

<sup>16</sup>Partnerships UK  
<sup>17</sup>Collaboratory for Research on Global Projects, Working Paper #39
### Key Characteristics (Cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Standardized Policies and Procedures**<sup>18</sup> | - Infrastructure New Approach to P3s document provided guidelines on policy  
  - Provides guidelines on selecting large, complex, replicable, innovative and politically sensitive projects  
  - Provides procedures for a successful procurement process |
| **Sector Coverage**<sup>17</sup> | - PUK sought to diversify its resources across the relevant sectors where P3s were being deployed  
  - PUK appointed sector coordinators to ensure that opportunities were being identified across the sector range  
  - This coverage included both central and local government  
  - Sectors included: transport, energy, communications, waste, water, flood, and intellectual capital |
| **Solicited / Unsolicited Policy**<sup>17</sup> | - Projects were procured using solicited bids; it remains unclear if unsolicited bids were accepted |

<sup>17</sup>Collaboratory for Research on Global Projects, Working Paper #39  
<sup>18</sup>Public-Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility
### Partnerships UK (PUK)
#### Key Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Criteria</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closed Transactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships for Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Wigan &amp; Leigh LIFT Tranche 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ MaST LIFT Scheme II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Paddock Healthcare Centre PFI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Camden &amp; Islington NHS LIFT Kentish Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Leeds LIFT Tranche 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Barking and Havering LIFT Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ BRAHM LIFT Tranche 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships for Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Newall Green High School BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ St. Mathews RC High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Castlefield Campus BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Bristol BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Nottingham BSF PFI – Second wave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Westminster BSF Phase 1 – 3 schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Bury, Tameside &amp; Glossop LIFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Halton &amp; St. Helens, Knowsley and Warrington LIFT Tranche 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Barnsley NHS LIFT Tranche 1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ St Helens LIFT Tranche 4 – Bluebell Lane Health Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Dollar Value of Closed Transactions</strong></td>
<td>$1.2 billion +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Transactions</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects in Pipeline</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Infrastructure Journal: Includes total project costs for above referenced transactions*