

POLICY BRIEF 2015-04

Financing U.S. Transportation Infrastructure in the 21st Century

MAY 2015



ADVISORY COUNCIL

The Hamilton Project seeks to advance America's promise of opportunity, prosperity, and growth.

We believe that today's increasingly competitive global economy demands public policy ideas commensurate with the challenges of the 21st Century. The Project's economic strategy reflects a judgment that long-term prosperity is best achieved by fostering economic growth and broad participation in that growth, by enhancing individual economic security, and by embracing a role for effective government in making needed public investments.

Our strategy calls for combining public investment, a secure social safety net, and fiscal discipline. In that framework, the Project puts forward innovative proposals from leading economic thinkers — based on credible evidence and experience, not ideology or doctrine — to introduce new and effective policy options into the national debate.

The Project is named after Alexander Hamilton, the nation's first Treasury Secretary, who laid the foundation for the modern American economy. Hamilton stood for sound fiscal policy, believed that broad-based opportunity for advancement would drive American economic growth, and recognized that "prudent aids and encouragements on the part of government" are necessary to enhance and guide market forces. The guiding principles of the Project remain consistent with these views.

Hamilton Project Updates

www.hamiltonproject.org
www.facebook.com/hamiltonproject
www.twitter.com/hamiltonproj

The views expressed in this policy brief are not necessarily those of The Hamilton Project Advisory Council or the trustees, officers or staff members of the Brookings Institution.

Copyright © 2015 The Brookings Institution

GEORGE A. AKERLOF
Koshland Professor of Economics
University of California, Berkeley

ROGER C. ALTMAN
Founder & Executive Chairman
Evercore

KAREN ANDERSON
Principal
KLA Strategies

ALAN S. BLINDER
Gordon S. Rentschler Memorial
Professor of Economics & Public Affairs
Princeton University

JONATHAN COSLET
Senior Partner &
Chief Investment Officer
TPG Capital, L.P.

ROBERT CUMBY
Professor of Economics
Georgetown University

STEVEN A. DENNING
Chairman
General Atlantic

JOHN DEUTCH
Institute Professor
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

CHRISTOPHER EDLEY, JR.
The Honorable William H. Orrick, Jr.
Distinguished Professor; Faculty
Director, Chief Justice Earl Warren
Institute on Law & Social Policy
Boalt School of Law, University of
California, Berkeley

BLAIR W. EFFRON
Partner
Centerview Partners LLC

JUDY FEDER
Professor & Former Dean
McCourt School of Public Policy
Georgetown University

ROLAND FRYER
Henry Lee Professor of Economics
Harvard University

MARK T. GALLOGLY
Cofounder & Managing Principal
Centerbridge Partners

TED GAYER
Vice President &
Director of Economic Studies
The Brookings Institution

TIMOTHY GEITHNER
Former U.S. Treasury Secretary

RICHARD GEPHARDT
President & Chief Executive Officer
Gephardt Group Government Affairs

ROBERT GREENSTEIN
Founder & President
Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

MICHAEL GREENSTONE
The Milton Friedman
Professor in Economics
Director, Energy Policy Institute
at Chicago
University Of Chicago

GLENN H. HUTCHINS
Co-Founder
Silver Lake

JIM JOHNSON
Chairman
Johnson Capital Partners

LAWRENCE F. KATZ
Elisabeth Allison Professor of Economics
Harvard University

LILI LYNTON
Founding Partner
Boulud Restaurant Group

MARK MCKINNON
Former Advisor to George W. Bush
Co-Founder, No Labels

ERIC MINDICH
Chief Executive Officer & Founder
Eton Park Capital Management

SUZANNE NORA JOHNSON
Former Vice Chairman
Goldman Sachs Group, Inc.

PETER ORSZAG
Vice Chairman of Corporate and
Investment Banking
Citigroup, Inc.

RICHARD PERRY
Managing Partner &
Chief Executive Officer
Perry Capital

MEEGHAN PRUNTY EDELSTEIN
Senior Advisor
The Hamilton Project

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER
Distinguished Institute Fellow
& President Emeritus
The Urban Institute

ALICE M. RIVLIN
Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution
Professor of Public Policy
Georgetown University

DAVID M. RUBENSTEIN
Co-Founder &
Co-Chief Executive Officer
The Carlyle Group

ROBERT E. RUBIN
Co-Chair, Council on Foreign Relations
Former U.S. Treasury Secretary

LESLIE B. SAMUELS
Senior Counsel
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP

SHERYL SANDBERG
Chief Operating Officer
Facebook

RALPH L. SCHLOSSTEIN
President & Chief Executive Officer
Evercore

ERIC SCHMIDT
Executive Chairman
Google Inc.

ERIC SCHWARTZ
76 West Holdings

THOMAS F. STEYER
Investor, Philanthropist, & Advanced
Energy Advocate

LAWRENCE SUMMERS
Charles W. Eliot University Professor
Harvard University

PETER THIEL
Technology Entrepreneur & Investor

LAURA D'ANDREA TYSON
Professor of Business Administration
and Economics; Director, Institute for
Business & Social Impact
Berkeley-Hass School of Business

MELISSA S. KEARNEY
Director

Financing U.S. Transportation Infrastructure in the 21st Century

The economy of the United States depends on our nation's system of transportation infrastructure. Every day, billions of dollars' worth of freight is transported using the nation's roads, railroads, airports, seaports, and inland waterways. Tens of millions of people commute to work using roads and public transit maintained by state and local governments.

This critical system is in need of sustained investment. Most Americans feel the growing burden of a weakening transportation infrastructure. In many cases, the signs are readily apparent: poorly maintained and congested roads, structurally deficient bridges, outdated airports and seaports, weak passenger rail service, and inadequate public transportation. These problems result in unnecessary delays, damage to vehicles, and added costs for businesses and consumers.

Economists, policy makers, and business leaders widely agree on the benefits of greater and more-strategic investment in the country's aging infrastructure. Careful research has linked such investment to increased productivity and job creation, in both the short term and the longer term. Furthermore, now is an opportune time to invest in infrastructure, with public borrowing rates near historic lows, and the construction sector still far from fully recovered. Finally, recent natural disasters such as Hurricane Katrina and Superstorm Sandy have exposed the significant costs of inadequate infrastructure and have demonstrated the need to improve resilience in the face of climate change.

Despite these compelling arguments in favor of increased investment, public infrastructure investment in the United States—both as a share of our gross domestic product and in total dollars—has been falling, not rising. The revenue sources that have historically helped finance the building and maintenance of highways, bridges, and transit systems have not kept up with the cost of maintenance, let alone the cost of new (or replacement) construction. Disagreements among government leaders—at the local, state, and federal levels—over how to pay for new investments have contributed to a *de facto* policy of inaction that our country can ill afford.

It is crucial to resolve this stalemate and launch a federal initiative to increase investment before the state of U.S. infrastructure declines further. In a new Hamilton Project discussion paper, Roger C. Altman of Evercore, Aaron Klein of the Bipartisan Policy Center, and Alan B. Krueger of Princeton University suggest a series of proposals to increase investment in the nation's infrastructure in both the short and longer terms. In the short term, the authors offer four targeted proposals: (1) expand and enhance the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) program, (2) reauthorize the Build America Bonds (BABs) program, (3) better utilize the Army Corps of Engineers (Army Corps) and Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF), and (4) adjust the federal gas tax to enhance price stability and increase revenue. Over the longer term, they recommend that the federal government (1) design incentives for states and localities to adopt innovative technologies to more efficiently collect user fees, (2) create a national platform for pooled procurement to lower construction costs, and (3) develop a national strategy for infrastructure to improve coordination of investment across levels of government.

The Challenge

Considerable evidence suggests that wise infrastructure investment offers a high return for society. In the near term, infrastructure investment creates jobs and can stimulate the economy more effectively than other types of government investment. Over the longer term, quality infrastructure investment increases the prospects for economic growth, reduces negative externalities such as congestion and pollution, and improves mobility and choice for consumers and businesses. In fact, public infrastructure investment has been linked to significant private sector productivity gains, and in many cases, these returns were higher than equivalent private capital investment. Substantial returns to investment come from new construction as well as maintenance of existing infrastructure: fix-it-first advocates point to evidence showing that every \$1 spent on preventive pavement maintenance results in \$4 to \$10 in savings in future repairs. Conversely, not investing in infrastructure can have adverse consequences. For example, recent research has found that 27 percent of the nation's major urban roads are in substandard condition, costing each urban driver roughly \$380 per year in additional fuel and car maintenance.

However, even as aging infrastructure has made the need for investment more acute, spending on infrastructure has fallen, not risen, in recent years. Spending as of 2014 was \$416 billion dollars, down from \$457 billion in 2003, after adjusting for inflation. Additionally, the Highway Trust Fund (HTF), the main source of federal funding for highway and mass transit, faces increasingly dire financial conditions. The federal gas tax supplies the HTF, but because it has remained at 18.4 cents per gallon since 1993, its ability to raise revenue has been eroded by inflation and improving fuel efficiency. Indeed, since 2008 expenditures from the HTF have exceeded revenues, and without transfers from the general revenue fund, the HTF would be insolvent.

Challenges are not limited just to a dearth of funds, but also to how these funds are allocated. For example, the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF), established by Congress in 1986 to fund construction, operations, and maintenance of ports and harbors, had a balance approaching \$8.5 billion in 2014, as revenues have grown faster than expenditures. However, HMTF rules specify that the balance cannot be used for other types of infrastructure.

Furthermore, the United States has a highly decentralized system of infrastructure investment and operation, with states and localities playing a major role in selecting, funding, financing, and operating infrastructure. Nonetheless, these agencies are often highly dependent on financial assistance from the federal government in their long-term planning for both infrastructure maintenance and new construction. This system of fiscal federalism can exacerbate the challenges of limited investment, as uncertainty about federal support creates additional obstacles to coordination, resulting in project delays.

The authors suggest that improving infrastructure investment requires federal leadership. Although there have been varied attempts, often bipartisan, to expand federal support for infrastructure in recent years, the authors note that no legislation to fundamentally reform the national infrastructure financing system has advanced through any legislative committee, suggesting that approaches that rely on executive action may hold more promise. The authors note that a bipartisan, legislative solution is ideal, but suggest that in the absence of agreement in the near term, opportunities also exist for executive action that could ameliorate the current impasse.

A New Approach

Altman, Klein, and Krueger offer a series of proposals to improve the quantity and quality of infrastructure investment in the United States. Four of these proposals can be implemented in the near term, while three would strengthen infrastructure investment over the longer term. Many of these proposals would not require additional federal outlays and would attempt to make infrastructure investment more efficient.

Proposals for the Short Term

The authors offer four proposals for near-term action that would reform and enhance existing programs. First, the authors recommend expanding and revising the TIFIA lending program by increasing its annual funding authorization, expanding its scope of eligible projects, and adjusting how it assigns project credit ratings. Second, the authors propose restoring the BABs program. Third, they propose more-efficient use of the existing surplus in the HMTF to support high-priority Army Corps projects. Finally, the authors propose reforming the gas tax to promote price stability and to protect the HTF from insolvency.

1. Reform the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA)

TIFIA was created in 1998 as part of a broader surface transportation act to reauthorize federal spending. It provides direct loans, loan guarantees, and standby lines of credit to qualified infrastructure projects of state and local transportation agencies that are approved by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT). These projects can cover almost any form of surface transportation, from the construction of a new bridge, to the building of a new subway line, to the installation of real-time traffic monitors. However, the projects must have a dedicated source of revenue with which to repay the federal government in order to be eligible. Furthermore, TIFIA loans can provide only part of the funding needed for a project, with this fraction recently rising from one third to one half.

In its seventeen-year history, TIFIA has loaned about \$22 billion to help finance more than fifty projects valued at \$80 billion. The authors note that, because almost all these loans have been paid back in full, TIFIA actually costs the federal government little on net. That is one reason why TIFIA has already grown: TIFIA's funding appropriation was \$125 million per year until 2012, and this level increased to \$1 billion by 2014. Because of the nature of the loan guarantees, including repayment and matching funds from project sponsors, these appropriated sums can finance far greater amounts of actual infrastructure costs.

However, the authors argue that despite the recent increase in TIFIA appropriations, improving and expanding the program could catalyze additional infrastructure investment. They cite as possible factors the growing infrastructure deficit, the continued movement toward reliance on debt financing rather than upfront payments, lingering issues of depressed credit from the recent financial crisis, and the size of loans available under TIFIA.

In order to meet the potential demand for infrastructure financing, the authors propose a three-part TIFIA expansion: First, federal appropriations should be increased from \$1 billion per year to \$10 billion per year. They calculate that this change alone would allow financing for infrastructure projects totaling more than \$200 billion. Although this is not enough to fully address the infrastructure backlog, the authors assert it is sufficient to induce new construction of large-scale projects that otherwise would probably not be built. Additionally, TIFIA expansion could free up funds for regular operations and maintenance of existing infrastructure.

Second, the authors suggest that project eligibility should be expanded beyond surface transportation to include seaports and airports, as well as economic development that maximizes the value of infrastructure assets, such as transportation nexuses. Expansion to seaports would

provide additional financing for dredging and crane replacement to accommodate larger ships; airport authorities could upgrade their air traffic control and instrument systems to better manage air traffic. Although TIFIA has been limited to surface transportation because its funding historically came from the gas-tax-supported HTF, the authors maintain that this rationale should no longer apply since the HTF is increasingly supported by general revenues.

Third, Altman, Klein, and Krueger call for more closely aligning TIFIA project credit scoring with historical experience. Currently, each project is assigned a credit score that represents the expected cost to the government relative to the size of the loan; over the history of TIFIA, the average credit score has been 9.3 percent, meaning that the government expects to lose 9.3 percent of the amounts loaned. However, there is evidence to suggest that TIFIA is overly conservative in its credit scoring. Of the forty-eight loans made with TIFIA assistance by 2014, only two have defaulted, and in both cases the government projects that it will recover most of its money. Over all forty-eight loans, the government is expected to get 99.9 percent of its money back. In line with this evidence, the authors contend that cutting TIFIA's average credit subsidy score by half would still be prudent relative to historical experience, and allow up to four times the level of infrastructure investment. To be clear, the authors agree that projects should continue to be scored on a case-by-case basis to account for differential risk. They also note that revision to credit scoring can be done entirely by the U.S. Department of Transportation, as a modification of program rules.

2. Restore the Build America Bonds (BABs) program

Created in 2009 as a temporary measure during the Great Recession, BABs complement tax-exempt municipal bonds as ways for localities to raise money for capital projects. Whereas conventional municipal debt is indirectly subsidized by the federal government through the tax code—because interest earned on the debt is exempt from federal income taxes—BABs are directly subsidized, with the federal government paying part of the interest.

The authors point out that municipal bonds are an inefficient way to raise needed funds. Most buyers of municipal bonds are high-income American taxpayers but the marginal bond buyer is in a lower-income tax bracket. Consequently, some of the federal subsidy for tax-exempt bonds accrue to high-income Americans, and interest rates are not as low as they would be if the marginal buyer were in the top income-tax bracket. In contrast, because of the direct federal subsidy, BABs enable localities to offer taxable bonds at higher interest rates than would otherwise be possible, in order to attract a more diversified set of buyers, including foreign investors, pension funds, nonprofits, moderate-income Americans, and other individuals and institutions that do not benefit from tax-exempt interest income. For the twenty months they existed, BABs were issued in all fifty states and the District of Columbia; the U.S. Department of the Treasury estimated that they saved issuers around \$20 billion relative to traditional tax-exempt municipal debt.

The authors propose bringing back BABs, the authorization for which ended in 2010. The federal government could choose to set the explicit subsidy equal to a revenue-neutral rate (roughly 28 percent) so that there would be no net cost to taxpayers. Alternatively, the subsidy rate could vary and be relatively more generous for higher-priority projects, such as those that cross jurisdictional lines or involve multiple modes of transportation, while still being revenue-neutral on average.

3. Reform Use of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) and the Army Corps

The Army Corps plays a critical role in improving seaports and waterways and responding to natural disasters. It routinely dredges harbors to enable ships to pass, restores beachfronts after hurricanes, and is in charge of producing nearly a quarter of the nation's hydropower. The authors point out, however, that the Army Corps

often lacks the funding to take on important jobs and its resources are not always directed at the highest-priority projects.

The authors propose remedying both problems by reforming the HMTF, which was established in 1986 for the operation and maintenance of harbors. Supported by a tax proportional to the value of ships' cargo, the HMTF has routinely taken in more money than it has spent, and had a balance that approached \$8.5 billion at the end of the 2014 fiscal year. The authors propose making use of this surplus by reallocating it to select Army Corps projects. To allocate the money efficiently, high-priority projects would be selected through a competitive process, whereby ports would submit proposals for funding in a manner analogous to USDOT's Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) program. Criteria for selection by USDOT would include the case for economic competitiveness, the leveraging of nonfederal funds, safeguards for environmental sustainability, and improvements in resilience. Additionally, to raise HMTF fees more effectively, the authors suggest shifting the money collected from a proportional tax to a flat user fee, which would be more in line with land and air cargo fees and less distortionary than the current system.

4. Reform the Gas Tax

Additionally, the authors propose reforming the gas tax to better support the HTF. Established in 1956 as a means of financing the U.S. Interstate Highway System, the HTF today provides critical funding for the construction and maintenance of many federal and state highways, as well as public transit systems. However, the federal gas tax of 18.4 cents per gallon that supports the HTF has not changed since 1993—it would be 30 cents per gallon today had it kept up with inflation. Moreover, rising demand for construction materials in developing countries has caused the cost of maintenance and new construction to increase over the past decade. As a consequence, the HTF has periodically been in deficit since 2008, with authorized expenditures exceeding revenue, and Congress has repeatedly transferred general revenues to shore it up. With fuel economy improvements expected to continue, further depressing collections, the authors anticipate that the fiscal condition of the HTF will deteriorate further under the status quo.

To resolve this issue, the authors recommend two changes to the gas tax. First, they support adjusting the gas tax so that it rises when gas prices fall, and falls when gas prices rise, which would lead to less price variability at the pump. (This is in the spirit of an earlier proposal calling for a similar variable tax on oil, but here applied directly to gasoline.) They would specify both minimum and maximum thresholds for the tax, with the minimum somewhat below today's tax and the maximum substantially above it. Second, both thresholds and thus the tax itself would be indexed to inflation so that the real level of funding stays constant. To complement these changes, the authors suggest setting transportation appropriations based on ten-year revenue estimates in order to smooth out annual fluctuations.

Proposals for the Longer Term

Altman, Klein, and Krueger also offer three proposals that would improve infrastructure investment over the longer run: (1) new federal incentives to encourage localities to experiment with cutting-edge technologies for the collection of user fee revenue, (2) development of a federal platform to increase opportunities for pooled procurement among states and municipalities, and (3) creation of a national infrastructure strategy.

1. Design Incentives for New User Fee Technologies

Much of the funding to pay for transportation infrastructure has come from user fees, such as gas taxes and highway tolls. This funding strategy, the authors note, has several drawbacks that are likely to become more problematic over time. For instance, it has long been recognized that drivers (or infrastructure users, more generally) are not the only people who benefit from infrastructure: Local stores and property

Roadmap

- The federal government will: increase the funding available under the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) program from \$1 billion to \$10 billion annually; expand the eligibility of TIFIA applicants from surface transportation modes to include seaports, airports, and other forms of transportation; and adopt more-accurate credit scoring to more effectively leverage federal financing. Taken together, these reforms will allow TIFIA to support up to \$400 billion in state- and locally sponsored transportation projects.
- The federal government will restore the Build America Bonds program to provide a direct interest subsidy to support infrastructure projects financed by state- or locally issued debt, at no net cost to the federal government.
- The Army Corps of Engineers will use the surplus in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund on high-priority infrastructure projects, selected through a competitive bidding process.
- The federal government will reform the gas tax, indexing it to inflation and allowing it to vary inversely with the price of gasoline within a set range. The revenue will go to the depleted Highway Trust Fund.
- The federal government will encourage state and local governments to adopt innovative user fee technologies through funding and financing incentives.
- The federal government will establish a national procurement platform and make incentives available to state and local governments to encourage them to benefit from economies of scale in their purchase of transportation materials and equipment.
- The federal government will establish a commission to develop a multimodal, longer-term strategic infrastructure plan. The commission's plan will be used to guide subsidies for future infrastructure investments.

owners often see greater business and increased property values from infrastructure investment—for example, construction of an express route can attract new shoppers—but these beneficiaries generally do not bear the costs of building and maintaining this infrastructure, at least not in proportion to what they gain from it. Moreover, even among users, the growth in fuel-efficient and alternative-fuel vehicles, ride-sharing services, and changing attitudes among millennials towards vehicle ownership and driving suggest conventional user fees may become less reliable as a source of revenue.

To address this longer-term problem, Altman, Klein, and Krueger propose creating federal incentives for states and localities to implement new ways of employing technology that expand how user and beneficiary fees are collected. Specifically, they argue for three roles for the federal government: (1) assisting in developing and standardizing new technology for the collection of beneficiary fees, (2) subsidizing projects that adopt new approaches to revenue collection, and (3) creating a national center within USDOT to coordinate research on revenue collection technologies. This enhanced federal role builds on the American tradition of strong local control in project delivery and selection, while positioning the federal government in areas where it has long held a comparative advantage—such as facilitating standardization and supporting applied research.

Learn More about This Proposal

This policy brief is based on The Hamilton Project discussion paper “Financing U.S. Transportation Infrastructure in the 21st Century,” authored by:

ROGER C. ALTMAN
Evercore

AARON KLEIN
Bipartisan Policy Center

ALAN B. KRUEGER
Princeton University

As an example of the first role, the authors recommend the establishment of national revenue collection standards. These standards would include the interoperability of electronic toll collection such that a single transponder—whether E-ZPass in the Northeast and Midwest, SunPass in Florida, or FastTrak in California—would work throughout the country. It would also allow for the creation of a smartphone application that could function similarly to transponders. Additional examples include federal guidelines for congestion pricing, in which fees adjust by time of day or measures of traffic, and “incremental finance districts,” in which anticipated increases in property tax revenue from new infrastructure are set aside to help pay for that infrastructure.

However, because the exact collection of fees will vary, reflecting differences in political will, geography, and economic circumstances, the authors propose allowing some flexibility for state and local governments to develop revenue collection mechanisms that work in their region. Local transportation authorities that submit strong proposals for new systems of revenue collection, to be reviewed by USDOT officials in a manner similar to TIFIA applications, would qualify for federal matching grants. These grants would be more generous for projects that involve multiple jurisdictions and multiple modes of transportation.

Finally, Altman, Klein, and Krueger call for combining federal centers relating to infrastructure that are currently isolated and spread across multiple government agencies into a single center housed at USDOT. An important role for this combined center would be to act as a hub focused on developing and promoting user-fee technology. This hub would serve to bring together professionals, academics, market participants, infrastructure providers, and government officials involved in infrastructure design, construction, operation, and finance. Creating such a national hub for technology development could help spur greater innovation, standardization, and collaboration.

2. Encourage Pooled Procurement

Often, state and local governments are the actors making investment choices about infrastructure, from the asphalt used for highways, to road signs, to public buses. The dozens of state governments and the thousands of local governments usually make these investments in isolation, without necessarily coordinating with other agencies, even if they are purchasing similar products. This decentralization of payers for infrastructure results in the loss of economies of scale, in which larger purchasers are able to negotiate better prices. As a result, costs are often proportionately higher for smaller infrastructure providers. The

authors propose that the federal government encourage more pooled procurement of infrastructure purchases to solve this coordination problem—and realize the advantages of economies of scale—to benefit smaller state and local infrastructure projects.

Specifically, they suggest a two-pronged approach. The first prong is the creation of a national platform for pooled procurement. This would be an electronic system, open to all infrastructure operators, that would allow agencies to search for and post information regarding their needs for procurement. The federal government would serve only as the platform operator and would not be involved in actual procurement or negotiation. This national platform would facilitate a larger network of potential agencies that could work together. In the longer run the platform could even be turned over to the private sector or a public-private consortium for operation. Complementing this digital platform would be a second prong in the form of direct financial incentives: localities that demonstrate cost savings through pooled procurement would receive additional federal grants explicitly tied to infrastructure funding. The authors argue that an incentive system similar to the Department of Education’s “Race to the Top” might be enough to overcome both organizational gridlock and impediments to coordination.

3. Create a National Infrastructure Strategy

Finally, Altman, Klein, and Krueger call for a commission on national infrastructure strategy, housed within USDOT, to guide longer-term strategic planning and to improve coordination of infrastructure investment at a high level. This commission would consist of federal, state, and local parties, as well as transit authorities, public advocates, and private companies, and could be created through legislation or executive order. It would be responsible for developing a comprehensive national infrastructure strategic plan, and for building on the strategic plans already created for specific modes of transportation within the federal government as well as the strategic plans developed by states, metropolitan planning organizations, and private infrastructure partners. The commission’s first task would be to identify where these various existing strategic plans are in convergence and where they are in divergence. It would further analyze and identify national goals and priorities. Ideally, the strategy would identify which modes of infrastructure were most cost-effective in addressing key challenges in certain corridors and regions. The commission would also make recommendations for improving data collection on infrastructure use and needs. Finally, the commission could help determine how subsidies for funding and financing infrastructure investment should be allocated optimally.

Conclusion

The United States is in need of greater and more-effective investment in infrastructure. The timing is right: public borrowing rates are near historical lows; the sectors that help build infrastructure, such as construction and manufacturing, remain slack and would benefit from greater demand; and the expense of fixing problems will only grow with further delay. The challenge has been finding a politically viable solution for how to pay for this investment.

Altman, Klein, and Krueger propose a series of initiatives to rekindle infrastructure investment by improving the efficiency of ways to finance it. In the near term, an enhanced and strengthened TIFIA program, a restoration of the BABs program, better utilization of the HMTF and the Army Corps, and changes to the gas tax would all provide greater funds for transportation infrastructure at little net cost to the federal government. Over the longer term, the authors propose mechanisms to promote the adoption of more-effective user and beneficiary fees; the design of a federal platform for pooled procurement; and the creation of a national infrastructure strategy. These initiatives would lead to enhanced coordination in infrastructure investment with greater revenues and lower costs.

Questions and Concerns

1. Won't a greater reliance on user fees disproportionately burden lower-income individuals?

User fees that are not tied to income, as is the case with most governmental fees, are inherently regressive, meaning that lower-income individuals pay a higher share of their income toward the tax than do higher-income individuals. This is true for the gas tax, highway tolls, and bus fares. Yet, because the benefits of infrastructure are distributed relatively progressively, the regressivity of user fees may be lessened. First, the jobs created from infrastructure investment in construction, manufacturing, and trade typically pay in the middle range of wages. Second, to the extent that users value infrastructure improvement equally, the benefits as a share of income are greater for lower-income individuals. Third, even if lower-income drivers avoid driving on toll roads to save money, and higher-income drivers use them freely, both groups still benefit from less congestion on each road. Furthermore, public transit is often available on a subsidized basis. Finally, more-efficient infrastructure can reduce air pollution, and resultant health benefits will be concentrated among lower-income individuals.

2. Is there sufficient demand to justify expanding TIFIA?

A potential critique of the proposal to expand TIFIA is that it relies on a build-it-and-they-will-come principle. Although there is demonstrated demand in excess of the current level of funding, this may not be true at the level called for in the proposal, and municipalities may be less constrained in financial markets as credit recovers. Nonetheless, if there is to be an imbalance between the supply and demand for infrastructure financing, it is in the nation's interest to err on the side of having too much financing available rather than too little. Furthermore, knowing that additional financing is available may encourage planners to consider the longer term. Planning over a longer horizon is particularly important for infrastructure projects that are to be built to levels anticipating future demand rather than current demand.

Highlights

Roger C. Altman of Evercore, Aaron Klein of the Bipartisan Policy Center, and Alan B. Krueger of Princeton University offer seven proposals to address the lack of investment in the nation's infrastructure and improve its financing. These proposals—four of which would be implemented in the short run while three would be implemented in the longer term—would reduce inefficiencies, create jobs, and spur economic growth.

The Proposal

Expand TIFIA. The federal government would expand the amount of funding available through the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) from \$1 billion to \$10 billion annually, expand eligibility to nonsurface transportation infrastructure projects such as airports and seaports, and improve internal accounting to increase the amount of private sector financing that can support TIFIA projects.

Bring Back BABs. The federal government would restore the Build America Bonds program to provide a direct interest subsidy to support infrastructure projects financed by state- or locally issued debt, at no net cost to the federal government.

Expand Utilization of the Army Corps of Engineers and Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. The federal government would more effectively employ the Army Corps to carry out high-priority projects funded with the \$8.5 billion Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund surplus.

Reform the Gas Tax. The federal government would index the gas tax to inflation and have it vary inversely with the price of gas to promote price stability and shore up the Highway Trust Fund.

Modernize User Fee Technologies. The federal government would incentivize state and local governments to adopt new forms of user and beneficiary fees to finance infrastructure projects, while also encouraging innovation in user fee technologies.

Encourage Pooled Procurement. The federal government would establish a national platform and provide funds to state and local governments to encourage pooled procurement of materials and equipment.

Develop a National Infrastructure Strategy. The federal government would create a commission charged with longer-term strategic planning and coordination between the many modes of the nation's transportation infrastructure. Their strategic plan would guide subsidies for infrastructure investment.

Benefits

These proposals would help increase infrastructure investment by expanding financing, more-efficiently using existing funding sources and developing new sources, lowering costs, and improving coordination and planning across levels of government. Increased infrastructure investments would reduce economic inefficiencies and costs from deferred maintenance, boost economic competitiveness, create jobs, and encourage economic growth.



1775 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036

(202) 797-6484

BROOKINGS



Printed on recycled paper.

WWW.HAMILTONPROJECT.ORG