

**Infrastructure Council Agenda**  
**March 26, 2015 3pm – 5pm**  
**ARCH 331**

**AGENDA**

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of February Minutes
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: Tuesday, **28 April (\*Note date change)**
7. Adjournment

**Infrastructure Council Minutes (DRAFT)**  
**February 19, 2015 3pm – 5pm**  
**ARCH 331**

Present: Joe Aufmuth, Gail Hansen de Chapman, Megan Forbes, Tara Cataldo, Jeff Roth, Ray Thomas, Ann Wehmeyer, Caroline Wiltshire, Dimitri Bourilkova, Patrick Reakes, Sue Alvers and Bradley Walters.

The meeting was called to order by Bradley Walters at 3:02 p.m., and November 2014 minutes were approved.

**Contributing Committee Reports**

- **Senate Steering Committee (S)** – Bradley Walters
  - Agreed to put a resolution against guns on campus on Senate agenda.
  - The Campus Master Plan is in comment stage and faculty can submit comments to Linda Dixon. Plans are for the university to adopt the plan over the summer.
- **Lakes, Vegetation and Landscaping Committee (J)** – Gail Hansen
  - Approved additional tree removal in the O’Connell Center Plaza.
  - Recommended that the date palms should be moved and relocated to the new President’s House from the Newell Hall Renovation.
  - Approved removal:
    - Seven pines at the golf course that had problems with fungus
    - Five pines by the new indoor football practice arena
    - Trees by Entomology Building because they were in poor shape
    - Lake Alice dredging
- **Preservation of Historic Buildings and Sites Committee (J)** – Joe Authmuth
  - Approved the following:
    - Student Life Office project
    - Sigma Sorority project
    - McCarty D Improvements
- **Parking and Transportation Committee (J)** – Ray G. Thomas
  - Recommended an increase of 4% decal pricing. This will assist to build two new parking garages
  - The committee recommended that there should be an increase in some of the fines.
- **Land Use and Facilities Planning Committee** – Megan Forbes
  - Addition to the Reitz Union
  - Newell Hall was approved with concern was raised about the pedestrians in the area of construction.
  - Approved:
    - Master Plan Final Draft
    - Indoor Football Practice Facility
    - Office of Student Life
    - Approved the O’Connell Center with changes to the sloping staircase.
    - Approve design phase for Sigma Kappa
- **Sustainability Committee (J)** – Tara Cataldo
  - Noted that students are passionate about sustainability.
  - A task force within the Committee has reviewed the guiding principles component of the campus master plan 2025 relative to sustainability issues.

- Gave special recognition to Chris Machen
- Duke Energy Contract
- **University Libraries Committee (S)** – Jeffrey Roth
  - The Marston Library is being used more than ever before. Students work at small tables and a 3D printing lab is available.
  - Library is going back to the RCM to ask for reinstatement of funding that was helping to subsidize before state funding was decreased.
- **Faculty IT Subcommittee** – Mark McCallister
  - No report.

#### **New Business – Parking Privatization**

- The Walker Consultants Report on parking privatization was provided to the council for this meeting as information.
- Parking privatization was discussed with a goal of developing a document to present to steering then the Senate at the end of spring term.

#### **New Business**

- Concern was raised about building maintenance with Turlington and especially the Music Building. It was suggested to ask Curtis Reynolds to attend a meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m. with the next meeting scheduled for March 26.

**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.