INTERNATIONAL MUNICIPAL LAWYERS ASSOCAITION
2013 ANNUAL CONFERENCE
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

CONCURRENT AFTERNOON SESSION # 7

OHIO DOT AND PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

BY

Patrick J Piccininni, Chief Legal Counsel, Ohio Department of Transportation

S. Ross Irvine, Assistant Legal Counsel, Ohio Department of Transportation

Phil Hartman, Frost, Brown, Todd LLC

Steve Smith, Frost, Brown, Todd LLC

©2013 International Municipal Lawyers Association. This is an informational and educational report distributed by the International Municipal Lawyers Association during its 2013 Annual Conference, held September 29 -October 2, 2013 in San Francisco, CA. IMLA assumes no responsibility for the policies or positions presented in the report or for the presentation of its contents.

Ohio DOT and Public-Private Partnerships

The Ohio Department of Transportation is currently engaging in some very exciting new public-private partnerships. This paper is a short discussion on the different types of public-private partnerships, including current Ohio projects. Additionally, this paper will provide the basis to take these principles back to your municipality for consideration.

Patrick J Piccininni, Chief Legal Counsel, Ohio Department of Transportation

S. Ross Irvine, Assistant Legal Counsel, Ohio Department of Transportation

Phil Hartman, Frost, Brown, Todd LLC

Steve Smith, Frost, Brown, Todd LLC

8/16/2013

Ohio DOT and Public-Private Partnerships[1]

As budgets get tighter, new and innovative ways to deliver and provide government services are being developed. In Ohio, one such vehicle is the Public Private Partnership, otherwise known as P3 or PPP. The theory behind the P3 is to leverage private dollars to allow a public entity to provide a new way to deliver infrastructure projects. These projects range from highway and bridge construction to maintenance of parking facilities. While these types of partnerships have been used for many years in Europe and Asia, they are starting to gain foothold in the United States. As legal counsel for your municipality, becoming familiar with these projects and identifying the legal risks and rewards with these types of projects will enable you to not only facilitate the delivery of the projects, but allow you draft the agreements to protect the asset and the public treasury.

Since June 29, 2011, the Ohio Department of Transportation has had the authority to enter into P3's for the delivery of transportation infrastructure needs. The legislative framework allowed ODOT to begin to study what assets would best be suited for the P3 model. Additionally, ODOT drafted a policy that would allow it to procure the delivery in manner consistent with law.

We are not endeavoring to provide a definitive treatise on P3s. However, this paper and discussion hopes to provide a preliminary foundation of what the various P3 categories are; an overview of Ohio's current framework; concerns for all types of projects; and the ability to provide the P3 model at the municipal level. It is presented from both the client perspective and the consultant perspective.

Overview of Public-Private Partnership Categories

Public-private partnerships can be broadly separated into two categories. First, there is a public asset that already exists and the public entity controlling that asset wants to leverage that asset. Second, there is a lack of an asset and the public entity would like there to be one. The former situation is broadly defined as "asset

[1] This paper is a product of the staff at the Ohio Department of Transportation prepared specially for presentation at the International Municipal Lawyers Association's Annual Conference. The finding, expressions, interpretations, and conclusions do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Transportation's Executive Board, the Director, or Governor John Kasich.

management", "privatization", or "concession contracts". The latter is harder to define, but is generally known as a "new facility" proposal.

When dealing with an asset that already exists, another distinction must be made. Is the asset a potential revenue generator or is it an asset that requires expenditures? The former represents toll roads, parking garages, and other assets that have a user-fee involved and generate revenue. When using public-private partnerships with this type of asset, the arrangement is known as "privatization" or a "lease-concession".[2] These assets are typically leased to a private operator for a long-term contract. The private operator can collect the revenue from the asset in exchange for providing the public entity an upfront lump sum of money. This money can be put to use in other areas of government. The latter represents maintenance responsibilities for roads, buildings, and other potential expenditures. The public entity can transfer responsibility of operating and maintain the asset for a shorter length of time. This transfer allows for a strategic approach to operations and maintenance that can be priced out accordingly.

Long-term lease concessions are procured on a competitive basis, with the award going to the bidder who has the most attractive offer. Through 2012, five major long-term toll roadway transactions have closed. Below is a chart describing those transactions:

Roadway	Date	Length	Lease Term	Upfront Lease Payment	Additional Commitments Made by the Private Entity
Chicago Skyway	January 2005	7.8 Miles	99 Years	$1.83 Billion	Operate and Maintain
Pocahontas Parkway (Richmond, VA)	June 2006	8.8 Miles	99 Years	$611 Million	Operate and Maintain Upgrade to electronic tolling, construct a 1.58 mile Richmond Airport connector

[2] http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/p3/defined/long_term_lease.htm

Indiana Toll Road	June 2006	157 Miles	75 Years	$3.85 Billion	Operate and Maintain
Northwest Parkway (Denver, CO)	November 2007	8 Miles	99 Years	$303 Million, $40 Million placed in escrow contingent upon completion of additional parkway in specified timeframe	Operate and Maintain $200 Million administrative fee (total over lease term, inflation adjusted) $60 Million towards parkway extension
Puerto Rico PR-22 and PR-5	September 2011	54.5 Miles	40 Years	$1.08 Billion	Operate and Maintain $356 million in upgrades and safety improvements

Source: Federal Highway Administration

Additionally, there have been many local long-term lease concession parking deals. Most notably, the city of Chicago leased 36,000 parking meters to an investment collective for almost $1.2 billion.[3] These numbers show just how large and valuable PPPs can become.

The other PPP that involves preexisting facilities is an "operation and maintenance concession" or "asset management" contract. This partnership transfers the maintenance and operation responsibilities to a private entity.[4] Contractors can be paid either a fixed fee, or more commonly, on an incentive basis. For example, a municipality could engage a contractor to maintain a stretch of road running through a new residential development area. The contractor is paid monthly for maintaining asphalt, snow and ice removal, and appurtenance maintenance/construction. The contractor must meet maintenance requirements in order to be paid. This assures the public entity the work will be satisfactorily performed.

[3]http://www.cityofchicago.org/content/dam/city/depts/rev/supp_info/ParkingMeter/MeteredParkingSystemOrdinance.pdf

[4] http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/p3/defined/om_concession.htm

The largest example of this agreement is the Anton Anderson Memorial Tunnel in Alaska.[5] The tunnel was built using new-asset PPP methods and then the operation and maintenance portions were turned over to a private entity.[6] This project represents the gamut of what PPP projects have to offer.

The other major type of PPP involves new build facilities. Governments have used PPPs in agreements involving transportation infrastructure[7], water/sewage systems[8], and developing telecommunication systems[9]. The following are short summaries of the different procurement methods used. These terms are typically used in United States-based projects. The rest of the world uses different terms for describing the agreement, but the concepts are the same.[10] This guide intentionally omits design-build (DB) procurement methods. DB authorization is typically separate from PPP authorization, at least in the transportation world.[11] Additionally, design-build-operate-maintain agreements simply combine the design-build concept with the operate-maintain or "asset management" concept discussed above.



Public Responsibility — Private Responsibility

Public Private Partnership Options					
Traditional Public Responsibilities Performed In-House	Private Contract Fee Services	Design-Build	Design-Build-Operate-Maintain	Design-Build-Finance	Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain

A design-build-finance (DBF) procurement model awards one contract for the design, construction, and full or partial financing of the asset. There are three primary reasons to use this method. First, the public entity may have cash flow problems, i.e. not having enough cash to pay for the project. The public entity can

[5] http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/project_profiles/ak_andersontunnel.htm
[6] http://dot.alaska.gov/creg/whittiertunnel/faq.shtml
[7] http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/p3/index.htm
[8] http://www.bnamericas.com/news/privatization/brazils-copasa-prepares-27-year-wastewater-ppp
[9] http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/public-consultation-horizon-2020-ppp-proposal-%E2%80%9Chorizon-2020-advanced-5g-network-infrastructure
[10] http://www.ppiaf.org/sites/ppiaf.org/files/publication/How-to-engage-with-private-sector-Clemencia-Farquharso-Yecome-Encinas.pdf at pgs. 10-14.
[11] Ex. ORC 5543.22

require the private entity to pay for development costs in excess of moneys the public entity currently has. The public entity, with effective financial planning, can start work on projects that it otherwise would not have the money for. The second reason is that the public entity may want to defer payments on the project. This deferment can be for any reason, including an incentive to complete the project in a timely manner. The third reason is that some jurisdictions have debt capacity limits that affect how much debt a public entity can carry. This method transfers the debt to the private entity, relieving the public entity of that responsibility.

By transferring short-term financing to the private entity, the public entity can take advantage of private sector financing options. These options include self-financing by the private entity, commercial lending, and bonding. Some of these options could also be tax-exempt.[12] All of these methods have different amounts of risk that must be priced accordingly.

The other major procurement method is design-build-finance-operate-maintain (DBFOM). This agreement combines all the previously discussed methods into a project that is built from the ground up as a PPP. Within this agreement, there are two types of models. First is a tolling method. The private entity would design, construct, operate, and maintain a revenue generating asset. The private entity would then collect the revenue generated. These are highly technical arrangements requiring extensive risk analysis and financial planning. Numerous European and Asian DBFOM agreements have not turned out well because of poor planning and projections.[13] The second type is an availability payment structure. Availability payments are based on milestones within the project, such as initially completing specified construction activities or subsequently meeting operational performance standards. This method allows the public entity to retain the revenue-risk associated with tolling, potentially lowering costs associated with that risk.

The agreements and types of PPP listed above do not encompass all situations. Some states like Ohio allow for wide discretion in developing agreements involving the private sector. Ohio is currently developing a plan to leverage our commercially viable garages into new facilities in those areas. That agreement combines many portions of traditional PPP, but customized to our needs. PPPs allow Ohio to be aggressive in developing new procurement methods that will benefit the taxpayers and travelers in Ohio.

Overarching Concerns for All Public-Private Partnerships

[12] http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/p3/defined/dbfo_6320.htm
[13] See, generally, FN 8 at 99, 139

When discussing PPPs, there are overarching concerns that affect the project at every stage. These concerns can generally be classified into three categories: legal, financial, and public relations. This paper will focus on the legal aspects, and will mention key points within the others. As with all new programs and laws, the interplay between the old and the new must be carefully considered. At a state level, the statutes are poured over for a lengthy amount of time to make sure the law grants what the state wants to do, and nothing the state doesn't want to do. Public-private partnerships can even implicate state constitutional provisions.[14] Therefore, when proposing your own public-private partnership, research must be done to determine the implications of the law with local, state, and even federal laws.

Another legal concern that Ohio has dealt with is the appropriation limit. Current Ohio law only allows appropriations for the current biennium.[15] This means that on long-term contracts, Ohio cannot promise to pay commitments more than two years in the future. While that seems to seriously affect our ability to engage in DBF and DBFOM agreements longer than two years, it has become a non-issue. We've worked with our financial advisors and lenders to document in the contract that payment is subject to Ohio General Assembly Appropriations. The lender will have to take the risk that the Ohio General Assembly will appropriate enough money to ODOT to cover the project. Our appropriations do not draw from project-specific account, rather from the ODOT general fund. However, that risk does raise the cost of doing business because the lender has to account for the risk somehow. It does not invalidate the contract however. Please examine your state laws regarding appropriations when considering public-private partnerships.

Ohio also has a constitutional provision prohibiting the State from becoming a "joint-owner" with a private entity.[16] Contractual documents must be carefully worded in order to avoid violating this provision. Again, this concern can be easily solved by careful planning while contemplating a public-private partnership.

Tolling enabling and enforcement language must be considered for those contemplating any agreement that involves revenue generating assets. There must be an enabling law that allows the public entity to charge tolls for using the asset in question. Additionally, there must be enforcement language. In Ohio, we are currently seeking changes to our laws to allow for more creative ways to enforce tolling (electronic sensors).

Finally, there exists interplay between jurisdictions. In Ohio, we have what is known as the "Home Rule", which is a constitutional provision that grants municipal corporations certain powers that exist outside their authority found in the Ohio

[14] See Ex. Ohio Constitution Article 8, Section 4
[15] Ohio Constitution Article 2 Section 22
[16] Id. at Article 8 Section 4

Revised Code.[17] When Ohio seeks to implement comprehensive public-private partnerships, we must coordinate with the local municipalities and townships to ensure their cooperation in the project. This concept transitions into the larger issue of interplay between levels of government. For municipalities seeking to enact public-private partnership ordinances, a phone call to the state would be prudent.

These are just a few of the potential legal issues when dealing with public-private partnerships. The preceding issues are ones that Ohio has encountered thus far. New issues are always arising and present a unique opportunity to shape the future of transportation law in Ohio.

As to the financial concerns, public-private partnerships are not a "magic bullet" to stop all budget concerns. The financial considerations boil down to how risky the project is. When contemplating a public-private partnership, a risk matrix is the accepted practice in determining the feasibility of the project. This risk matrix encompasses all identifiable risks and attempts to anticipate the likelihood and severity of problems should they arise. All of those problems are taken into account in determining the cost of the project. Depending on the procurement methods of the project, the risk can be associated more with the public entity or the private entity. The chart on page 4 generally describes how the risk is split.

While public-private partnerships allow public entities to accelerate projects or even create new ones, a strong financial foundation must exist. Lenders will look at the public entity's book extremely closely, especially if this is a novel approach in the state/municipality. These arrangements are inherently riskier, but those risks can be mitigated to reap benefits of the structure.

The last overarching concern deals with the public relations issue. Over the years, there have been many successful public-private partnerships. However, those successes have been overshadowed by the grandiose failure of a few projects. When proposing a public-private partnership, critics will cite these failures to prohibit their use. These failures can be deconstructed down to specific reasons why they did not work. Below are a few that have received bad publicity.

- In 2008, Chicago leased all 36,000 parking meters in Chicago to Chicago Parking Meters LLC, an investment group led by Morgan Stanley, Allianz, and the government of Abu Dhabi. Chicago received 1.2 billion dollars for the 75-year lease. Mayor Daley pledged to use the interest on the upfront money to replace the $20 million the city collected annually form the meters. Instead, the city spent $1 billion of the payout within two years of adopting

[17] http://celdf.org/downloads/Ohio%20-%20Home%20Rule.pdf

the deal.[18] This problem is not with the underlying public-private agreement, rather a problem with mismanagement of the revenue from the asset.

- The South Bay Expressway was a 13-mile toll road east of San Diego. The road was leased to Macquarie Infrastructure Group for a term ending in 2042. In 2010, 28 months after opening, MacQuarie declared bankruptcy due to the housing crisis, recession, and decreased truck traffic from Mexico. A lengthy court battle ensued, ultimately resulting with the San Diego Association of Governments purchasing the road back from MacQuarie.[19] However, the road is seeing increased usage in recent years.[20] This perceived failure was due to inadequate traffic projections that thrust the operator into bankruptcy. There are solutions that have been developed since. Contractual provisions that allow sharing of decreased traffic revenue risk are now becoming the industry standard. After the SBX project, lenders are keener on mitigating that risk.

- The Dulles Greenway (SR 267) is a toll road west of Washington, DC. It has come under criticism for its escalating toll rates. When it opened in 1995, the toll for a car was $1.75. Today the rush hour rate is $5.55. Toll rates are flat, and while public officials have asked the operator to institute distance-based pricing, the operator has refused due to the likelihood that it will lose revenue. While the state regulates the rates like a utility, the concession agreement gives the private operator significant leeway. As a result, despite a major public outcry, public officials are virtually powerless to prevent even higher rates from taking effect, let alone roll back the current exorbitant rates. This problem could have been prevented by establishing clearer, most restrictive contract terms.

A Brief Overview of Ohio's Current Public-Private Partnership Laws and Projects

Ohio's public private partnership statutes were introduced in the Ohio House of Representatives on February 22, 2011.[21] Governor John Kasich signed the law into effect on June 29, 2011.[22] Ohio is now one of 33 states that have state-wide authorization allowing the use of public-private partnerships.[23] The newly created law allows the Ohio Department of Transportation to enter into public-private partnerships based on solicited and unsolicited proposals from private entities

[18] See FN2
[19] http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/project_profiles/ca_southbay.htm
[20] http://sbxthe125.com/whats-happening/enewsletters
[21] See http://lsc.state.oh.us/coderev/hou129.nsf/House+Bill+Number/0114?OpenDocument
[22] Id.
[23] http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/p3/state_legislation/

relating to transportation facilities. A PPP may cover anything from development, to construction, to operation of the facility. ODOT was also granted rule-making authority to carry out purposes related to PPPs.

Ohio's authorization allows for two types of PPP proposal models. First, ODOT may solicit proposals from the private sector much like any other procurement.[24] For example, ODOT would issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) and select the best proposal based on lowest-bid or best-value.[25] Depending on the size and complexity of the project, a multi-stage procurement process may be required. However, the processes and nomenclature is still similar to traditional procurement methods. The similarities between the methods allowed ODOT to conduct an industry outreach forum for the first PPP transportation project on October 12, 2012.[26] The ease of implementation allowed ODOT to go from the Governor's desk to an industry outreach program in 15 months.

Second, the law also authorizes unsolicited proposals from private entities.[27] This provision is critical in state-wide PPP legislation.[28] It truly allows for market resources to be directed where they are needed the most. By encouraging the private sector to be proactive, ODOT can devote resources to other development areas. Additionally, allowing unsolicited proposals can create new projects and ideas that ODOT would not be able to create on its own.

These two proposal methods, along with a myriad of other law changes, allow Ohio to boast one of the most expansive PPP authorization laws in the country. Our authorizing statutes were constructed in a way to allow the Ohio Department of Transportation great flexibility in conceiving transportation projects. ODOT also does not need legislative support for individual projects.[29] However, PPP authorizing statutes can also be constructed in different ways. A current listing of states with PPP authority can be found on the National Conference of State Legislator's website.[30]

Ohio currently has three major public-private partnerships programs at different stages of development. The Cleveland Innerbelt II project was initially designed as a DBF to demolish an existing bridge and construct a new eastbound bridge in the Cleveland Metro area. The initial plan was to have the developers finance a portion of the project cost to accelerate project completion by two years.[31]

---

[24] See ORC 5501.71 et al.
[25] See ORC 5501.71(A)(2)
[26] http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/InnovativeDelivery/Pages/InnerbeltDBF.aspx
[27] ORC5501.72 et al.
[28] See generally http://www.ncsl.org/documents/transportation/PPPTOOLKIT-AppendD.pdf
[29] See generally ORC 5501.70-5501.77
[30] http://www.ncsl.org/documents/transportation/PPPTOOLKIT-AppendB.pdf
[31] http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/InnovativeDelivery/Innerbelt%20CCG2/02-20121008-Innerbelt%20DBF%20Analysis.pdf

However, the procurement method was changed because ODOT received an influx of funds from the bonding on the Ohio Turnpike System.[32] These bond proceeds came with the requirement that they be used immediately. Therefore, ODOT made the decision to drop the "F" off the project and proceed as a design-build project. ODOT is planning to select the winning proposer on September 20.[33]

The second major public-private partnership is the Portsmouth Bypass. The Portsmouth Bypass is a four-lane, divided, limited-access highway around the City of Portsmouth in Scioto County, Ohio. The highway, to be designated State Route 823 (SR 823), is known as the Portsmouth Bypass and will comprise 16 miles of four-lane divided highway, bypassing approximately 26 miles of US 52 and US 23 through Portsmouth. The project will improve travel and regional mobility, avoiding significant numbers of traffic signals, intersections, and driveways over the current 26 mile route using US 52 and US 23. The proposed 16-mile new route is estimated to provide travel time savings of up to 16 minutes per trip over the current route using US 23 and US 52. The large number of access points and traffic signals currently compromise US 23/US 52's ability to safely and efficiently serve its intended function of a primary arterial.[34] This project is being developed as an availability payment-based DBFOM after an extensive value for money analysis. The contract will be for the construction period (estimated at five years) plus 35 years of operating and maintaining the bypass.

The third major public-private partnership is the Brent Spence Bridge Corridor. Originally opened in 1963, the Brent Spence Bridge and its approaches are key elements of the nation's Interstate Highway System. The bridge carries both I-75 and I-71 traffic through the Greater Cincinnati and Northern Kentucky area, but it also connects the region to eight other states as far north as Michigan and as far south as Florida. It is also one of the nation's busiest trucking routes, with three percent of the nation's gross domestic product (GDP) crossing the bridge each year. The bridge was listed as "functionally obsolete" by the National Bridge Inventory in 1998, due in large part to limited visibility and safety concerns. ODOT and KYDOT are currently investigating different procurement methods to provide the best value to taxpayers of both states. This project has the potential to be extremely large, with an estimated cost of $2.5 billion.[35]

[32] http://www.ohturnpikeanalysis.com/
[33] http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/InnovativeDelivery/Pages/InnerbeltDBF.aspx
[34] http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/InnovativeDelivery/Pages/PortsmouthDBFOM.aspx
[35] http://www.brentspencebridgecorridor.com/

Applying Public-Private Partnerships at a Municipal Level

In applying public-private partnerships at a municipal level, two initial steps must be taken. The first is identifying appropriate projects to use the public-private partnership concept on. The second is implementing those projects at a municipal level either through ordinances or by using existing state-level enabling statutes. In selecting potential projects, using previous projects as a guide provides an excellent resource for potential projects. If there are revenue generating assets in your municipality, those could be leveraged by leasing to a private entity.

The more complicated projects involve new assets. One of the major considerations is appropriate gearing. A project must be large enough to attract attention from the private sector. If the project will not benefit the private entity, there is no incentive to undertake the time and effort to understand public-private partnerships. Smaller projects are not feasible because of the increased transactional costs associated with public-private partnerships. There are two major tools used in identifying appropriate projects. The first is a Value for Money Analysis (VfM).[36] The value for money analysis is a process used to compare the financial impacts of a public-private partnership against those for the traditional public delivery method. This type of process must be used if federal funds are spent on the transportation project. Even if no federal funds are being spent, these are a great tool to determine the costs and benefits of a potential public-private partnership. A value for money study can also be used to show the public and other municipal government officials that this is an effective use of money.

The second major tool is a feasibility study. These studies are costly and provide extensive insight into a proposed public-private partnership. A private company is engaged to perform an extremely thorough examination of all aspects of the proposed arrangement. Ohio recently paid KPMG LLP $2.85 million dollars to perform a feasibility study on leasing the Ohio Turnpike. Those results can be found online.[37] Obviously these types of studies are intended for large, complex projects. Feasibility studies can also be performed on a much smaller scale for much cheaper.

Once a potential project has been selected, there must be a law or ordinance allowing the municipality to conduct all stages of the project. Everything from authorization to spend money, to allowing the private entity access to records, to enforcement options must be contained in the enabling law. There are two general options. First, the municipality can issue a project-specific ordinance authorizing the

[36] http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/pdfs/p3/factsheet_03_vfm.pdf
[37] http://www.ohturnpikeanalysis.com/Ohio-Turnpike-Opportunity-Analysis-12-12-12-FINAL.pdf

project. Chicago took that approach when leasing their parking meters. See the footnote for a copy of the city ordinance allowing the lease.[38] Depending on the state and local laws, this approach may be easier or more difficult. Another option is checking state law to see if there is authorization for municipalities to engage in public-private partnerships. Michigan currently has such a law.[39]

The last discussion point for public-private projects is engaging project advisors. These methods are novel and complex, two qualities that do not lend themselves well to a potentially small municipality. The three types of technical advisors are technical, legal, and financial. Depending on the size and complexity of the project, all three may be needed. If a public entity is unsure, there are even consultants to determine what the most effective team of consultants would best suit the project at hand.

In addition to having effective advisors, having an internal project manager is critical. If the municipality is small, this could be the law director or the city engineer. Whoever it is needs to have a background in project management. While the advisors will be doing most of the work, it is up to the project manager to make sure everything is running smoothly. If the size warrants, multiple people within the public entity should be engaged in the project. In special circumstances, additional employees with background in project management should be hired on.

All public entities should be cognizant that all written communications, documents, memos, etc., may be subject to disclosure under any applicable public record laws. This poses a unique challenge to the public entity because in some cases the dissemination of information would be detrimental to the public agency and could jeopardize negotiations or make the negotiation one-sided (not in the favor of the public agency). In some cases, disclosure of certain information is prohibited by law. In other cases, a specific exemption exists, i.e., attorney/client privilege or trade secret.[40] In any event, counsel must ensure that any legal review is undertaken before the disclosure of information is done.

In summary, public-private partnerships are a new, innovative tool that allows public entities to accelerate project timelines and leverage existing public assets. However, public-private partnerships can only fulfill this role if they appropriately combine the interests of the two partners. Developing public-private partnerships requires policy makers to have extensive foresight and vision in determining how this tool fits into the larger infrastructure development scheme.

---

[38]http://www.cityofchicago.org/content/dam/city/depts/rev/supp_info/ParkingMeter/MeteredParkingSystemOrdinance.pdf

[39] The Private Investment Infrastructure Funding Act MCL125.1871et seq. http://www.legislature.mi.gov/(S(ofmkon55gcn41f553npwv145))/mileg.aspx?page=getObject&objectName=mcl-Act-250-of-2010

[40] See, Ohio Rev. Code §149.43 et seq.

This paper provides a guide to the basics of public-private partnerships and hopefully serves as a motivator to return to your municipality and share these new and exciting ideas.