

# Overview of Program Structure of Governor's Transportation Initiative

Transportation Subcommittee of House Appropriations  
January 17, 2011

[ 1 ]

## Background

- On December 9, 2010 the Governor announced the initial details of his Transportation Initiative for the 2011 Session, which was expanded upon last Friday
- Some of the elements are reflected in the budget, others will be included in separate pieces of legislation to be introduced this Session
- Secretaries Brown and Connaughton will be presenting to the full committee this afternoon to provide additional details on the Governor's proposals both in terms of the transportation project-specifics and debt perspectives
- In advance of that presentation, Chairman May asked that I provide you some background information on the programs included in the proposal

[ 2 ]

## Overview of Proposal

- Acceleration of Capital Projects Revenue Bonds (HB 3202) to take advantage of low interest rates and construction costs
  - ✓ Does not increase the overall authorization of debt
- Authorize the issuance of \$1.2 billion of GARVEEs
  - ✓ These are not considered state debt because they are repaid with federal highway reimbursements
- Create a Virginia Transportation Infrastructure Bank to provide state support to assist PPTA projects and provide grants for local projects
  - ✓ Budget includes dedication of \$150 million GF and \$250 million of revenues identified in VDOT audit to this fund
- Also included in budget is proposal for \$50.0 million of VDOT NGF revenues to recapitalize the existing Transportation Partnership Opportunity Fund
  - ✓ Created and initially capitalized in 2005; additional GF support provided for specific-projects in 2007/2008
  - ✓ Now fully subscribed

3

## Overview of Proposal

- Utilize available toll credits to free up state funds for non federally-eligible projects
  - ✓ Doesn't result in additional federal funding, simply provides flexibility to use funds to meet most critical needs
- Expand existing VDOT Revenue Sharing Program
- Establish a Passenger Rail Capital and Operating Fund
- Adopt constitutional amendment to protect Commonwealth Transportation Funds from diversion to general fund
- Authorize use of up to 2% of general fund growth for transportation if revenue growth exceeds of 5%
- Amend language that dedicates 2/3 of general fund surplus revenues to transportation to ensure that 2/3 of all surpluses after required Rainy Day Fund payments are directed to transportation

4

## HB 3202 Bonds

- Chapter 896 of the 2007 Acts of Assembly (HB 3202) authorized the Commonwealth Transportation Board to issue up to \$3 billion in Capital Project Revenue Bonds;
  - ✓ The authorization was subsequently increased to \$3.18 billion in 2008.
  - ✓ Provisions of the bill authorized the issuance of \$300 million of bonds each year, with language allowing any unused prior year issuance authority to be carried forward
- No bonds were issued in FY 2008 or FY 2009 against the already authorized debt
- The first issuance of \$492 million of these bonds was sold in May of 2010
- Because the unused amounts carried-forward, in the current biennium there is authority to issue an additional \$1.008 billion in HB 3202 bonds
  - ✓ This includes \$408 million in carry forward authority as well as \$300 million additional in each year, FY 2011 and FY 2012
- The Debt Capacity Model updated this December assumes the issuance of \$493 million in bonds in FY 2011 and \$500 million in bonds in FY 2012
  - ✓ These amounts are allowed absent any legislative change
  - ✓ The amounts are built into the state's assumed debt issuance schedule and fit within both the state's overall debt capacity and existing CTB authorization authority

5

## HB 3202 Bonds

- Debt service for CPR bonds is provided for by the revenues of the Priority Transportation Fund (PTF) which are generated from:
  - ✓ 1/3 of the taxes collected on all insurance premiums;
  - ✓ The \$20.0 million of additional annual motor fuels tax assumed from the switch to collections at the rack;
  - ✓ PTF interest earnings;
  - ✓ Any Commonwealth Transportation Fund surpluses
- In order to meet projected project schedule needs, the Governor's proposal would provide for the issuance of an additional \$207 million in HB 3202 bonds in this biennium
- The Governor reports that proceeds from the sale of these bonds will be used to accelerate road, rail and transit projects currently in the Six-Year Improvement Program that have not been fully funded or were dropped from the SYIP due to recent budget cuts

6

## Federal Revenue Anticipation Notes (FRANs)

- Federal Highway Revenue Anticipation Notes, or FRANs, are a federally created innovative financing tool otherwise known as indirect GARVEEs
- The VTA of 2000 authorized the CTB to issue \$800 million of FRANs
- The original issuance cap was raised by the 2002 General Assembly and allowed for an outstanding principal limit of \$1.2 billion
- Virginia issued three series of FRANs totaling \$1,148,320,000 as follows:
  - ✓ Series 2000 - \$375,000,000
  - ✓ Series 2002 - \$523,320,000
  - ✓ Series 2005 - \$250,000,000
- Virginia's FRANs were issued as 10-year notes, thus the first series will be paid off this year
- As of June 30, 2010, there was \$395,460,000 in outstanding FRAN debt
  - ✓ The final tranche which will be paid off in 2016 as outlined on the following page

[ 7 ]

## FRAN Debt Service Pay-Off Schedule

Fiscal Year	FRAN Debt Service Requirements
2001	15,093,935
2002	45,328,996
2003	102,965,957
2004	121,493,581
2005	120,586,600
2006	144,393,690
2007	152,275,052
2008	152,296,812
2009	152,297,928
2010	152,303,120
2011	112,005,441
2012	98,584,053
2013	48,423,063
2014	31,715,775
2015	31,717,220
2016	7,925,392

[ 8 ]

## How Did Virginia Use FRANs?

- The original authorization for \$800 million in FRANs authorized in the Virginia Transportation Act of 2000 was attached to an extensive list of projects, with specific amounts attached to each project
  - ✓ The FRAN amounts and other PTF revenues were enough only to fund small portions of the projects
  - ✓ A JLARC review in 2001 indicated that the total project costs exceeded \$19 billion, far in excess of additional funding provided
- The FRAN authorization was increased in FY 2003 to backfill the \$317 million transferred from transportation to the general fund to help balance the budget
  - ✓ These FRANs were issued to fill the hole created in VDOT's Six Year Improvement Program caused by the diversion of the ½ cent general sales and use tax in FY 2003 and were never attached to particular projects
- As a result, it was difficult for Members and the public to see what was accomplished with the FRANs as they generally augmented only a small portion of projects sprinkled throughout the VDOT Six Year Program

9

## GARVEEs

- Direct Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicles, or GARVEEs, are bonds backed by future federal highway reimbursements for individually approved federally-authorized projects
  - ✓ Like FRANs, they are not state debt and do not require a pledge of the full faith and credit of the Commonwealth
  - ✓ Under Direct GARVEEs, reimbursements from the federal government cover the financing and interest costs of the debt
- How do direct GARVEEs work?
  - ✓ VDOT would apply to the Federal Highway Administration to use direct GARVEEs to finance a specific project
  - ✓ If authorized, the CTB would then issue bonds for a project or group of projects
  - ✓ VDOT then would bill FHWA for its portion (generally 80%) of the debt service including interest twice a year until the debt is retired
  - ✓ The reimbursement is subtracted from VDOT's annual federal highway funds

10

## GARVEEs

- Under federal law, direct GARVEEs have flexible maturities; the Governor's proposal establishes a maximum maturity of 20 years, with a target of 12 to 15 years
- Direct GARVEEs differ from FRANs as follows:
  - ✓ First, reimbursements for direct GARVEEs cover interest and other financing costs, not just project construction costs
  - ✓ Second, the more structured debt service/reimbursement linkage means VDOT knows the future impact on its planning and programming of other federal revenues
  - ✓ Third, the direct tie between the project and the debt leads to greater accountability and transparency – you know where GARVEEs have been used
- Legislation would limit total outstanding FRANs AND GARVEEs to \$ 1.2 billion
- The Administration reports that they would combine direct GARVEEs with toll credits and/or private funding and thus construct major infrastructure projects without spending a single state dollar

11

## Virginia Transportation Infrastructure Bank

- House Bill 1500 includes \$150 million general fund and \$250 million NGF in FY 2012 to provide initial capitalization for a newly created Virginia Transportation Infrastructure Bank (VTIB)
  - ✓ The general fund portion comes primarily from the FY 2010 year-end surplus and other FY 2010 unencumbered balances
  - ✓ The NGF portion represents existing VDOT revenues identified during the audit conducted this fall
- The Fund would be used to provide loans to private entities and local governments and also would authorize up to 20% of the funds to be used for grants to local governments
- The intent of the fund is to help offer low interest rate loans, and provide grants to localities and transportation and transit authorities
- Why does VDOT say they need a separate fund?
  - ✓ The federal program – TIFIA – which has been used to help finance large PPTA projects is oversubscribed and major project proposals submitted by Virginia have been denied

12

## Transportation Partnership Opportunity Fund

- Chapter 847 of the 2005 Acts of Assembly created the Transportation Partnership Opportunity Fund (TPOF) to encourage the development of transportation projects through the design-build provisions and pursuant to the Public-Private Transportation Act of 1995
- The TPOF may also be used to provide monies to address the transportation aspects of economic development opportunities
- Funding for the TPOF was initially provided in 2005 and in the 2006/2007 Sessions further funds were provided to the Fund for specific projects
  - ✓ Vast majority TPOF revenues have been assigned
- The amendments proposed in HB 1500 provide \$50.0 million from the VDOT nongeneral funds to recapitalize the fund

13

## Federal Toll Credits

- The initiative also envisions the use of \$456.0 million in federal toll credits to provide additional flexibility and fund non-federally eligible projects
- What are toll credits?
- For a portion of every dollar invested in capital and maintenance work on a toll road maintained by VDOT (even those not owned by VDOT), Virginia is awarded a credit
- These credits can then be used in place of the traditional 20% state match required on federal projects
  - ✓ Under the federal highway program, Virginia typically is required to pay 20% of the costs of a federal project with state dollars
  - ✓ Toll credits allow the Commonwealth to use federal funds to cover this 20%, thereby freeing the state revenues for other purposes
  - ✓ These credits do not increase the total amount of federal funds available to Virginia, but provide more flexibility in the use of our state funds
  - ✓ Essentially, by combining the toll credits with the bond revenues, the Commonwealth can complete major congestion-reducing projects without investing a single state dollar

14

## Proposed Changes to the Revenue Sharing Program

- VDOT's Revenue Sharing Program provides matching funds for localities for highway improvements within their jurisdiction
- Current Code language (§33.1-23.05) limits state project level contribution to \$1 million per project and limits the total program size to \$50 million per year
  - ✓ Prior to the passage of HB 3202 the cap was \$15.0 million
  - ✓ Additional funding has been provided through the HB 3202 bonds
- The *Code* also includes an enumeration to govern which projects should receive priority under the program, as follows:
  - ✓ First, for projects administered either directly or through a contract by the locality,
  - ✓ Next for projects in which the county contributes more funding than the state, and
  - ✓ Next for projects currently in the Six-Year Improvement Program that will be accelerated by participation in the revenue sharing program
- The Administration's proposal would eliminate:
  - ✓ The per project limit of \$1.0 million
  - ✓ The \$50 million annual programmatic limit
  - ✓ Any prioritization language

15

## Passenger Rail Capital and Operating Fund

- Under section 209 of the Federal Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act (PRIA), states must assume responsibility for capital and operational funding of all "regional" trains not part of long-haul corridors
- Virginia has 2 trains from Newport News to Washington and 2 from Richmond to Washington each day as well as the two new intercity regional passenger trains – Lynchburg and Richmond to the northeast corridor – with planned extensions to Norfolk which it will have to fund going forward
- Currently, the primary dedicated funding for rail – the Rail Enhancement Fund - supports freight rail improvements and is being fully utilized
- The Governor's proposal would create an Intercity Passenger Rail Capital and Operating Fund to support capital and operating expenses associated with intercity passenger rail
  - ✓ No new funding source is proposed for this fund
  - ✓ However, existing language in Title 33.1 authorizes the CTB to transfer up to 10% of TTF funds to particular rail projects if it determines they would reduce congestion

16