



The Port of Miami Tunnel has set several precedents as Florida has no history of constructing highway tunnels. With its flat topography, there has previously been little need for tunnelling, and underwater tunnelling in soft ground had, until recently, been viewed as too challenging technically. But the Port of Miami Tunnel has changed this perspective. Following its completion, the twin tubes are now the largest soft ground tunnels in North America, which is even more impressive considering the porous geotechnical conditions found under Biscayne Bay.

Because the project was so challenging. there were some who considered it to be unfeasible. When the project was initially proposed in February 2006 as Florida's first PPP highway project, there were plenty of critics. After shortlisting the three teams responding to its Request for Qualifications, FDOT commenced an industry review process designed to solicit and incorporate bidder input into the contract documents

As the first AP concession in the US, there was no domestic precedent to rely on. As a result, FDOT elected to modify US precedent from toll concessions to incorporate certain concepts from experience in the UK and Canada with AP concessions. In the process, FDOT created new precedent documents that have since formed the basis for most of the subsequent AP concession agreements used in the US

At the conclusion of the industry review process in November 2006, FDOT issued a Request for Proposals. The three shortlisted teams all submitted their bids in March 2007 and the results were impressive. Two of the three teams were well under FDOT's independent cost estimate for the project, with the winning team's construction price coming in at half of FDOT's estimate (\$610 million compared with \$1.2 billion). In May 2007, FDOT announced that the Miami Access Tunnel (MAT) consortium - composed of Babcock & Brown and Bouygues Travaux Publics - was the preferred bidder. At that point, the two sides only needed to finalise the contract and reach financial close

Unfortunately at that point, several storms hit the project's uncharted waters MAT's hid relied on private activity bonds with Lehman Brothers providing an underwritten commitment for a wrapped bond financing. By the end of 2007, with the onset of the recession, monoline insurers were no longer able to wrap large bond offerings while retaining investment grade ratings, forcing the parties to extend the deadline to reach commercial and financial close while MAT developed alternative financing structures.

MAT ultimately submitted an application for a loan from the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) through the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA), which required FDOT to federalise the project after receiving proposals - something never previously done. This gave the project access to low rate subordinated

66 With 10 commercial banks providing a \$322 million fivevear loan and a \$22 million six-year loan, TIFIA provided a \$341.5 million 35-year loan. In the end, the maximum annual availability payment was \$32.5 million, delivering \$2.2 million in annual savings to FDOT in real dollars from the original bid."

debt over 35 years, which is the same length as the term of the concession agreement. The project would likely have died without the USDOT's willingness to retrospectively validate the procurement from a federal compliance perspective, making TIFIA funding available as a financing tool for MAT.

Throughout this period, commodity prices and foreign exchange rates rose in response to the Lehman crisis and fallout in the markets more broadly. This posed a challenge and made it difficult for MAT to stay within the \$33.6 million annual maximum availability payment it had committed to in its proposal. In this unprecedented atmosphere, MAT's primary equity partner, Babcock & Brown, became a recession casualty and was forced to drop out of the transaction. With prices rising and the project sponsor in trouble, FDOT put the project on official hiatus in December 2008. Many thought that the project was gone for good.

Then the skies cleared. In the spring of 2009 FDOT's local partners - the City of Miami and Miami-Dade County - were pushing hard for the project to come back at the same time that commodity prices and foreign exchange rates were becoming more favourable. FDOT took the project off hiatus and allowed MAT to replace Babcock with Meridiam Infrastructure Finance, one of the world's leading equity investors in PPP transactions.

With a newly-reconstituted sponsor, full support from FDOT and local partners, and the addition of TIFIA, MAT was well positioned to pursue a bank club financing. In the end, the parties executed the concession agreement in June 2009 and MAT reached financial close on October 15th, 2009, nearly 32 months after MAT submitted its bid. With 10 commercial banks providing a \$322 million five-year loan and a \$22 million six-year loan, TIFIA provided a \$341.5 million 35-year loan. In the end. the maximum annual availability payment was \$32.5 million, delivering \$2.2 million in annual savings to FDOT in real dollars from the original bid.

Meanwhile the I-595 highway project set its precedents. From a technical perspective, the Port of Miami Tunnel and the I-595 Corridor Roadway Improvement projects could not be

more different. However from the financial perspective, the two have a great deal in common. The I-595 project consists of the reconstruction, widening and resurfacing of 21km of the existing I-595 route in Broward County, Florida. Central to the project is the addition of three at-grade reversible toll lanes in the median of the existing highway. While the tunnel project is technically difficult because of the porous rock under Biscavne Bay, I-595's technical difficulties stem from the need to safely operate and maintain traffic flows along a very busy route, while completely reconstructing the highway

FDOT issued the Request for Qualifications for I-595 in the same month the Port of Miami Tunnel was originally supposed to reach financial close - October 2007, just as the recession was getting underway. FDOT shortlisted four teams for the project in December 2007. In September 2008 two teams submitted proposals in response to the project's Request for Proposals Both remaining teams changed their composition during the evaluation process however. One of these changes was due to Macquarie shifting from an equity position to a financial advisory position on the I-595 Express team, leaving ACS Infrastructure Development as the team's sole equity member.

FDOT selected the I-595 Express team in October 2008 and the parties started the process to reach commercial and financial close. Shortly into this process, the I-595. Express team concluded that the bond financing it contemplated in its proposal would not work due to the collapse of the bond market and the collateral damage to monoline insurers caused by the recession, and so it shifted to a bank financing structure. To facilitate this change, FDOT provided some protection from interest rate movements and a risk-sharing mechanism for credit spread movements, which proved to be critical to helping the deal move forward at the height of the recession.

With both sides working together, the parties reached commercial and financial close on March 4th 2009 - roughly four months after selection. The financing package for the project included a group of 12 banks providing a \$525 million nine-year loan and a \$255 million 10year loan, with TIFIA providing a \$678 million 35-year loan.

Though the Port of Miami Tunnel concession agreement hit the market first, the importance of I-595 cannot be understated. First and foremost, I-595 showed the US market that a properly structured project - even a \$1.8 billion deal - can be financed in a very tough financial market. In addition, the ability to reach financial close on I-595 played a significant role in finally bringing Port of Miami to a successful, though long-delayed, financial close.

Based on the success of the Port of Miami and I-595 projects. FDOT reached financial close on the I-4 Ultimate project, which is a \$2.3 billion reconstruction and widening of 34km of Interstate 4 in Orange and Seminole Counties. The largest AP concession in the











1. Extensive works were carried out to ensure the project remained on track (*image courtes*) of Daniel Azoulay) 2. Safety measures were mnlemented to protect construction personn from the live traffic running alongside the project (image courtesy of Florida Department of ransportation) 3. The route of the Port of Miami Funnel runs through soft ground conditions and was driven using a specially configured TBM (image courtesy of Daniel Azoulay) Construction operations were extensive (image courtesy of Florida Department of Transportation) . The Port of Miami Tunnel has been construct despite major challenges, both technically and financially (*image courtesy of Daniel Azoulay*) 6. Free flow tolling technology ensures optimum



FACTS

Project (POMT)

Florida Department of Transportation's (FDOT)

US\$1 billion

Two 1.28km traffic tunnels connecting Watson Island

and the Port of Miami (Dodge Island) beneath Biscayne Bay in Florida. The route of the twin tunnels runs under Government

Cut, the main shipping

channel in Biscayne Bay.

Bouvaues Civil Works Florida is the design-build

139.3m

KEY EXCAVATION TOOL

12.9m diameter cutting

Herrenknecht TRM, with a

head and a total length of

KEY CHALLENGE:

This is the largest tunnel project so far carried out in soft ground conditions in North America



© Route One Publishing OCTOBER 2014

