

**Infrastructure Council Agenda  
November 18, 2014 3pm – 5pm  
ARCH 331**

**AGENDA**

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of 25 September 2014
3. Reporting of Contributing Committees:
  - Senate Steering Committee (S)
  - Lakes, Vegetation, and Landscaping Committee (J)
  - Preservation of Historic Buildings and Sites Committee (J)
  - Parking and Transportation Committee (J)
  - Land Use and Facilities Planning Committee (J)
  - Sustainability Committee (J)
  - University Libraries Committee (S)
  - Faculty IT Subcommittee
4. Parking Privatization
5. New Business from Council Members
6. Next Meeting: Thursday, 12/18
7. Adjournment

**Infrastructure Council Minutes (DRAFT)**  
**October 23, 2014 3pm – 5pm**  
**ARCH 331**

Present: Megan Forbes, Andrew Giacini, Gail Hansen, David Oppenheimer, Patrick Reakes, Ray G. Thomas, Bradley Walters, Ann Wehmeyer, Caroline Wiltshire, and Fedro Zazueta.

The meeting was called to order by Bradley Walters at 3:00 p.m., introductions were made and minutes from September were approved with revisions. Fourth bullet under Faculty IT Subcommittee was revised to read: "In 2012, UF had an online course production capacity of 45 courses per year."

**Contributing Committee Reports**

- **Senate Steering Committee (S)** – Bradley Walters
  - Bradley distributed a handout showing side-by-side comparisons of annual decal and permit costs from the University of Florida and Ohio State University for the 2014-15 academic year.
  - Parking privatization will be discussed at the November Infrastructure Council meeting, then at contributing committees in December, then back to Infrastructure Council in January to allow for presentation of findings to Senate in February or March 2015.
  - There was a question about costs for visitor parking, and whether there was information available from Ohio State that could serve as a reference for UF.
  - Fedro Zazueta noted that there was currently a 5-year waiting list for gated parking spaces at UF.
  - Committee members speculated that more private spaces will likely be built adjacent to UF as parking prices on-campus increase and/or as availability of spaces decreases.
  - Ray Thomas noted that on-campus parking space valuation was underway by Parking Committee. If parking valuation exceeds cost paid for permits, additional valuation may be defined as a benefit for employees paid for by UF.
  - There may be an interest in disincentivizing parking on campus, but UF is moving away from punitive pricing of spaces. General increases in costs and elimination of spaces have reduced parking on campus. Students have been utilizing mass-transit more, which helps reduce parking demand.
  - Parking and Transportation has a guaranteed ride service for carpool permit holders, if spouse has to go home early. As noted on <http://www.parking.ufl.edu/subpages/carpool.html>, "*The Emergency Ride Home Program allows participants in the Carpool Program to leave campus in the event of an unexpected personal or family emergency. A member of the TAPS or UFPD staff will drive you home in an official vehicle, or TAPS will reimburse you for cab fare home upon submission of a valid receipt, as approved by TAPS (please obtain cab fare approval prior to 4:00 PM).*" This should be advertised more widely to encourage participation in the car pool program. Ray Thomas noted that this has only been used approximately three times in the last ten years.
  - It was noted that student permit costs at Ohio State are much higher than current costs at UF. As a result, privatization may impact students more than other groups.
  - The ZIP car rental service on campus is now self-supporting.
  - Discussions are underway to possibly incorporate Campus Cab (<http://parking.ufl.edu/subpages/campuscab.html>) into RCM to provide dedicated funding or

consolidate the program with SNAP (<http://www.police.ufl.edu/community-services/student-nighttime-auxiliary-patrol-snap/>). Ray Thomas noted that discussions are presently underway.

- There was a question about providing additional off-campus satellite parking. Paul Davenport has suggested light rail or monorail hub and spoke network on-campus.
- **Lakes, Vegetation and Landscaping Committee (J)** – Gail Hansen
  - At the October 9, 2014 meeting, one major project was approved: Communications Infrastructure Building (at College of the Arts). The project is located on the north side of College of the Arts building B, with access from Stadium Road.
  - The committee also reviewed the status of the Master Plan Update.
- **Preservation of Historic Buildings and Sites Committee (J)** – Joe Authmuth
  - No report.
- **Parking and Transportation Committee (J)** – Ray G. Thomas
  - Newell Hall renovation was discussed. The project should have minimal parking impacts. The committee is looking at the sharp turn in Stadium Road adjacent to Newell Hall, as it limits the movements of busses, especially in the southernly/western direction. Re-design of this roadway to ease the turn will be included in the Newell Hall design work.
  - Newell Hall will include façade restorations, as well as mitigation of asbestos, lead, and mold (\$500,000 mold mitigation needed)
  - The committee also discussed the status of the Master Plan Update.
- **Land Use and Facilities Planning Committee (J)** – Megan Forbes
  - At the October 7, 2014 meeting, two major projects were approved: UF-591 ENT/Ophthalmology (programming phase and site selection) and UF-461 NEXUS/ Engineering (programming phase and site selection).
  - The ENT/ Ophthalmology building is to be located adjacent to the Orthopedics building on Hull Road and SW 34th Street, and will include clinical, teaching and research space.
  - The NEXUS/ Engineering building will be an expansion of the Nuclear Engineering building, near the Reitz Union.
  - Campus Master Plan 2025 Update was discussed, including updates to the temporary building policy. The committee requested that facilities provide a yearly report with an accurate inventory of all temporary buildings on campus as well as suggested dates of removal for all temporary buildings.
  - There was some discussion about provisions relating to tree removal at satellite properties, which was referred to the Lakes, Vegetation, and Landscaping Committee for consideration.
- **Sustainability Committee (J)** – Tara Tobin Cataldo
  - Tara Tobin Cataldo was unable to attend the meeting but reported by email that the majority of the first meeting was taken up with a presentation from Linda Dixon on the Campus Master Plan. Two task forces are being formed to address immediate issues. One task force will be making recommendations to the Campus Master Plan Steering Committee on adding/editing sustainability principles to the Campus Master Plan 2025. The other task force will work with the Office of Sustainability on addressing gaps such as curriculum tracking in the next STARS report (due in February 2015). STARS is the Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System that measures colleges and universities sustainability performance.
- **University Libraries Committee (S)** – David Oppenheimer
  - There continues to be discussion about funding of journal subscriptions relative to available budget funds. Journal subscription costs are increasing rapidly.
- **Faculty IT Subcommittee** – Fedro Zazueta
  - A review of the architecture of UF Information Technology systems has been initiated. The aim of the review is to eliminate downtime as well as difficulties with authentication. The project

- will involve creation of a redundant infrastructure, which will have high cost implications. The recommendations of the technical committee should be ready within one month.
- Additional training for the new Canvas course management system is being arranged. There is more faculty interest in deeper skills, rubric creation, and in-depth training. The new training sessions will begin in about two weeks.

### **New Business**

- Reports prepared by Walker Parking and Morgan Stanley include proprietary information that prohibit their release and detailed discussion. This is a concern. There is a need for more transparency to allow Senate involvement in shared governance.
- Similar concerns were raised about companies teaching classes for freshman through Pathways program. Agreements preclude UF faculty involvement.
- There were expectations that parking privatization at UF might yield \$280M in revenue. Consultants have indicated that this amount may be much lower, closer to \$110M. This is believed to be part of why parking privatization has been deferred for now.
- UF improvements in lighting of parking facilities have saved \$35,000 in one garage through reduced energy costs.
- UF parking decal prices did not increase in 2014-15.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m. with the next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, November 18.

**University of Florida**  
 2014-15 Annual Decal Prices

<b>Faculty/Staff</b>	
Official Gated	\$ 1,140.00
Gated	\$ 1,020.00
Official Business	\$ 426.00
Orange	\$ 318.00
Blue	\$ 318.00
Medical Resident	\$ 444.00
Shands South	\$ 318.00
Staff Commuter	\$ 162.00
Disabled Employee	\$ 318.00
Carpool	\$ 144.00
Motorcycle/Scooter	\$ 154.00
Average	\$ 432.91

<b>Students</b>	
Green	\$ 154.00
Park & Ride	\$ 154.00
Red 1	\$ 154.00
Red 3	\$ 154.00
Brown 2	\$ 154.00
Brown 3	\$ 154.00
Disabled Student	\$ 154.00
Motorcycle/Scooter	\$ 154.00
Average	\$ 154.00

Rate Increases:  
 5-year average increase: 6.4% (as of Fall 2013)

Reference: University of Florida Purchasing,  
 "ITN14LD-104 Financial Advisor for Parking and  
 other opportunities," Attachment A,  
[http://www.purchasing.ufl.edu/vendors/bid/2014\\_](http://www.purchasing.ufl.edu/vendors/bid/2014_Bids/ITN14LD-104/Attachment%20A.pdf)  
[Bids/ITN14LD-104/Attachment%20A.pdf](http://www.purchasing.ufl.edu/vendors/bid/2014_Bids/ITN14LD-104/Attachment%20A.pdf)

**Ohio State**  
 2014-15 Annual Permit Prices

<b>Faculty/Administrative Professional</b>		
A	Central Campus Surface Parking with Garage Access	\$ 841.56
CX	Buckeye Lot Surface Parking	\$ 218.52
WA	West Campus Surface Parking (No Garage Access)	\$ 218.52
WAE	West Campus surface Parking with Off-Peak Garage Access	\$ 315.96
	Average	\$ 398.64

<b>Classified Civil Service Staff</b>		
B	Central Campus Surface Parking	\$ 434.04
BE	Central Campus Surface Parking w/Off-Peak Garage Access	\$ 554.28
BG	Central Campus Surface Parking w/Limited Garage Access	\$ 784.80
CX	Buckeye Lot Surface Parking	\$ 218.52
WB	West Campus Surface Parking	\$ 108.72
	Average	\$ 420.07

<b>Students</b>		
C	Central Campus Surface Parking	\$ 293.76
CE	Central Campus Surface Parking w/Off-Peak Garage Access	\$ 510.96
CG	Central Campus Surface Parking w/Limited Garage Access	\$ 771.24
CXC	Buckeye Lot Surface Parking	\$ 145.56
WC	West Campus Surface Parking	\$ 103.56
WC5	West Campus Surface Parking w/Carmack 5 Overnight Storage	\$ 423.96
CP	Central Campus Surface Lot Parking w/Overnight Garage Access	\$ 654.48
	Average	\$ 414.79

Rate Increases:  
 The 50-year agreement caps rate increases on parking at 5.5% annually for the first 10 years.  
 After 10 years, rates are set to be capped at 4% or a rolling five-year average of inflation,  
 whichever is greater.

Reference: <http://thelantern.com/2013/12/50-year-agreement-osus-483m-parking-deal-stands-alone-among-schools-year-1/>

**Parking Privatization/Monetization Notes (DRAFT)**  
**Infrastructure Council**  
**Draft: November 16, 2014**

**A. INTRODUCTION**

1. Charge of Infrastructure Council: The University of Florida is considering the possibility of privatizing and/or monetizing its parking facilities. The Senate Steering Committee has asked the Infrastructure Council to review positive and negative impacts of parking privatization relative to the University's Teaching, Research, and Service/Extension missions.
2. Definitions: (derived from <http://www.walkerparking.com/our-services/monetization/>)
  - a. Privatization, Public/Private Partnership, P3, or PPP: Strategy for private financing of public infrastructure projects. Public entity benefits from new infrastructure with little or no capital outlay while private entity benefits through a structured contractual agreement and stipulated investment returns over time. A contractual agreement between a public agency (federal, state or local) and a private sector entity is developed, specifying the ownership and operational risks and responsibilities of the public and private sector entities.
  - b. Monetization: A form of a public/private partnership that involves the conversion of existing parking assets into legal tender. The public entity is provided with up front funds and the private entity profits through long-term lease agreements involving the operation and management of parking assets.
3. Each of the following Contributing Committees were asked to consider the impacts of Parking Privatization/Monetization as it may pertain to their specific committee's purview.
  - Lakes, Vegetation, and Landscaping Committee (J)
  - Preservation of Historic Buildings and Sites Committee (J)
  - Parking and Transportation Committee (J)
  - Land Use and Facilities Planning Committee (J)
  - Sustainability Committee (J)
  - University Libraries Committee (S)
  - Faculty IT Subcommittee
4. The Infrastructure Council and its Contributing Committees are not able to assess the financial viability of parking privatization/monetization. This work would require the specialized input of professionals skilled in this area. We would encourage involvement by other faculty groups and committees, especially the UF Budget Council.

**B. BENEFITS OF PRIVATIZATION / MONETIZATION**

1. The University of Florida could receive a sizeable up-front cash payment in exchange for a long-term lease agreement. The up-front payment could fund an endowment, which could annually fund teaching, research, and/or service/extension operations in perpetuity, depending on market returns and yearly expenditures. Example: The 50-year agreement between Ohio State and CampusPark

included an initial payment of \$483 million to the University. Over the duration of the agreement, this is expected to provide \$3.1 billion in investment earnings for the University (\$50 to \$60 million per year). In its first year, Ohio State's long-term investment pool earned an 11.6 percent rate of return (FY13). Approximately \$20 million was distributed to support university priorities, including teaching, learning, research, and transportation.

2. Turnover of spaces makes parking profitable. Parking vendor/partner would likely develop phone- and/or computer-based apps to allow for real-time tracking of spaces available in lots on campus, which may improve ability of students/faculty/staff/visitors to find open spaces.
3. If there are financial incentives to promote the construction of new facilities and/or specific contractual requirements to provide new facilities, privatization might increase the availability of parking spaces.
4. Possible increases in parking costs may increase the number of privately-developed off-campus parking spaces available.

### **C. NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF PRIVATIZATION / MONETIZATION**

1. Many agreements (including Ohio State's) tie permit cost increases to various indexes of inflation. Given that salaries often do not keep pace with inflation, there is the likelihood that permit costs will increase as a percentage of salaries over time.
2. To provide a financial benefit for private partners, there is the assumption that annual increases with privatization would need to be higher than if no private partner was involved. These annual increases would impact all parking users, including faculty, staff, students, and visitors.
3. There is the possibility that parking regulations will extend from current daytime hours into nighttime hours and/or weekend hours as well. This will increase costs for students/faculty/staff who participate in evening courses and/or live on campus.
4. The possible alteration of existing lots to incorporate toll booths and/or gates may reduce the total number of spaces available.
5. Outsourcing of parking management and operations may reduce the opportunity for faculty involvement and/or shared governance.
6. Contractual obligations may limit the opportunity for the university to adjust land use over time if/as required to support changes in the teaching, research, or service/extension missions of the university. The University's current master plan process provides for a ten-year planning horizon, where privatization may effectively require a 50-year planning horizon, at least with respect to parking infrastructure.
7. The possible reclassification of existing parking spaces from one permit type to another and/or the creation of new permit types may increase the costs of parking in certain areas of campus.

### **D. OPEN QUESTIONS AND/OR NOTES**

1. Privatization may consist of a considerable range of different kinds of financial relationships. Questions about scope of operational responsibilities, administrative management, facility maintenance (structural, aesthetic, drive surfaces, stairs, elevators, electrical, equipment, landscaping, etc.), safety/policing, and lighting/energy use are some of the many questions that will require precise clarifications in any agreement.
2. There are open questions about the administration of parking as it pertains to large campus/community events, including home football games, concerts/events, etc. The current relationships between UF and the University Athletic Association may need to be revisited.

3. There are questions about existing departmentally-controlled parking spaces, which would need to be considered in drafting of an agreement.
4. Should UF seek to pursue this kind of public/private partnership, the development of an agreement should include significant faculty participation and review. Note that the complete, executed Ohio State agreement is 810 pages in length.
5. Privatization will require precise surveys and delineation of parcels to be leased to private partner. This is easy for larger, consolidated parking areas but will be more complex for the many smaller, distributed parking areas on campus. Each lease area will require a certified survey and legal description for attachment to an agreement. The Ohio State agreement includes 369 pages of surveys and legal descriptions of parcels.