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TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: The next meeting is the Facilities Planning Committee.

Ms. Russell, could you please call the roll?

MS. RUSSELL: Chairman McWilliams?

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Here.

MS. RUSSELL: Trustee Boyce?

TRUSTEE BOYCE: Here.

MS. RUSSELL: Trustee Lawson?

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Here.

MS. RUSSELL: Trustee Moore?

TRUSTEE MOORE: Here.

MS. RUSSELL: Trustee Warren? Trustee Warren?

TRUSTEE WARREN: Here.

MS. RUSSELL: Trustee White?

TRUSTEE WHITE: Here.

MS. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, a quorum is present.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Thank you. Trustees, we have one action item, and two informational items, and one discussion item.

First, the action item is the approval of the minutes of the Facilities Planning Committee meeting of May 19, 2015.

Are there any comments or corrections to the minutes? Thank you, hearing none, can we have a
motion for approval?

TRUSTEE WHITE: Second.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Motion is moved and seconded. All those approve by the sign of "aye."

(All answer affirmatively.)

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Thank you, the minutes are approved.

Now, we move on to the two informational items and Mr. Sameer will proceed with updates.

MR. KAPILESHWARI: Thank you, Trustee McWilliams.

Good morning, members of the Board, Madam President, and my dear colleagues. I am Sameer Kapileshwari and I'm Associate Vice-President For Facilities and Safety team. Today we have two informational items.

The first one is the Crestview sign. The former Senator Peaden who was a driving force behind FAMU's rural diversity health center in Crestview, Florida, died on June 23, 2015. Senator Peaden was a big supporter of FAMU and was instrumental in launching interdisciplinary satellite campus in downtown Crestview, Florida.

In recognition of all of his hard work and support to the University and community, naming the facility with his name will be a well-deserved honor.
Please see the attached and proposed signage. This particular change of sign has been also approved by the 2014 legislative session.

The second information item we had was legislative updates. We are extremely thankful for the Florida Legislature for the support and for helping us provide our students with a 21st century living and learning environment.

During the 2015 special legislative session, the Florida Legislature approved items that would enhance the University's capacity for academic excellence. Approved items included $1.4 million to complete the FAMU College of Pharmacy and Pharmacy Sciences II building, and $6.2 million for the planning and design of the new student affairs, or CASS, Center for Access and Student Success building. This Legislature appropriations for enhancement allow the University to improve the student experience and help to promote retention and graduation. It will combine under one roof many essential student services that are currently scattered around the campus and improve the customer service and promote efficiency and effectiveness.

The $1.4 million in Capitol funding will help complete the Pharmacy II building, which is scheduled
to be completed in 2016.

Upon completion, this new 74,000 square feet research facility will house the necessary research and lab space that will allow FAMU to compete successfully for federal research grants.

Mr. Chair, this completes any informational item updates.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Thank you. Trustees, does anyone have any questions or comments?

Mr. Chair?

Could we go back to the signage for the building, for the Crestview center?

I have been informed that the name change will require a vote of our committee for recommendation to the Board. I will say, for those of you and I guess many of you who are not familiar with Senator Peaden, he was a champion for FAMU and he what was a man of many talents. He was a physician, but he also was a legislator and an entrepreneur, and he did many things in the field of health care. If you've read, various student medicine and dental centers across the country.

But rumor had it that one of our neighboring institutions from another state -- I think it was Auburn -- was kind of looking at that area, to move
into it, and Senate Peaden kind of took FAMU off and
said, "Look, you have a pharmacy school and let's tie
this area up in FAMU over there," and that's what
legislative and all of the other things he was able to
do for us.

So I would say, I think the name change was a
friendly -- the name change is very appropriate in my
opinion, and my recommendation would be that the
Committee would vote in favor of the name change. And
I submit that I that to the Board, so I'm going to
hear a motion?

TRUSTEE WHITE: So moved.

TRUSTEE BOYCE: Second.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Moved and seconded. Further
discussion? All in favor, let it be known by saying
"aye."

(All answer affirmatively.)

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Thank you very much.

Okay. So the next thing you have on your agenda,
though, is a discussion about, Mr. Sameer, a big
project, a comprehensive project that we've been
waiting a long time to hear about, so let's move on.

I think he's going to give us a discussion and
make a presentation about this P-3 concept
development, so Mr. Sameer, would you proceed with
that?

MR. KAPILESHWARI: Thank you, Trustee McWilliams.

Good morning, again. This presentation is to facilitate a discussion and explore the concept of P-3, the Public Private Partnership for the University and possible alignment with the University leadership.

In recent months, we have heard several discussions about city and county initiatives related to the south side of Tallahassee. FAMU's voice to serve as a catalyst for the new revitalization of South Monroe/South Adams corridor, and the envelopment of our on campus, which is like our "main street" or passing through the corridor of our campus.

We envision our transformational development that will help to make in the evolution of FAMU as one of the nation's premiere universities, often also referred to as the best-in-class university. This catalyst product will not only assist in designing some of the critical housing needs and aesthetics concerns, and simultaneously create a viable marketplace that could promote long-term sustainability of the University.

We have all heard and seen several reports of the link between the student graduation rates related to their facilities on campus. US News and World report
articles say that some national universities have as high as 99 percent of their undergraduates residing on campus. Several Ivy League institutions are in mid-nineties. In the recent survey, the average data for undergrads at national universities who lived on campus was around 38.6 percent. Our goal would be around 33 percent.

Some reports say that incoming freshmen who live in university housing for one year are 20 percent more likely to graduate than incoming freshmen who never live on campus. Living on campus for two years boosts the graduation rate to almost 25 percent higher than the students who live off campus through their graduation expedience.

What will all of this mean to us? One of the University's long-term strategy will be to develop communities that promote 21st century living and learning environments. Creating such universities will require modern facilities that not only provide academic programs necessary to spur retention and graduation, but also the present day amenities that are Millennial and that their parents demand and expect as part of the educational experience.

Now, let's take a look at an aerial view of our facilities. This is also referred to many of us refer
to as women's dorm or simply the residence homes.

The two on the west side along Village East are
McGuinn Hall and Diamond Hall, and the one on the back
on the east side are and Cropper, Wheatley and Truth
Halls.

Currently, we have four of the five residence
halls that are currently vacant. These are McGuinn
which opened in 1938; Diamond, Cropper and Wheatley,
which opened in 1947; and the relatively newest among
them, the Truth Hall, which opened in 1958.

Four residence halls, namely McGuinn, Diamond,
Cropper and Wheatley, were taken offline last fall
after the opening of the 800-bed FAMU Village. These
facilities have several infrastructure and critical
maintenance needs, along with some safety and code
compliance. Note that these facilities still have
some costs associated with them in terms of compliance
and some maintenance; however, being offline these do
not bring in new revenue.

These facilities are located on our main street
very close to the entrance to the campus. We are also
part of the historic district. As said in the
previous light the revitalization of the South
Monroe/South Adams is part of the long range and
economic revitalization strategy for the City of
Tallahassee and Leon County.

The next couple of slides show the aerial view of the Pentaplex and the South Monroe and Adams corridor on the east side of campus.

Now, let's spend some time, a few minutes, understanding the basis of need. Currently, we have 2,382 beds available; however, can only bring roughly 1,398 as marketable space. By "marketable," we mean these are the ones comparable in types of amenities where our students can find often around campuses and in the secondary markets. For example, quality, size, location and amenities. These 1,398 are made of 800 at FAMU Village, 360 at Palmetto III, and recently 157 in Sampson Hall and 81 in Young Hall.

Now, looking at how these compare to our potential need. Even assuming (unintelligible) and our 1,519 FDIC freshman and 1,256 sophomores, we come up with a total need of 2,775, compared to a total 1,398 we currently have, but leaving us with the potential gap of 1,377.

Apart from the number of spaces, our students also need and deserve and commercial/retail space to serve them better. There is one more current view of our McGuinn and Diamond Halls taken from MLK Boulevard.
Now, let's look at if we do decide to move forward with the P-3 concept exploration, how the P-3 does apply and how our project will look.

According to the BOG's draft, Public Private Partnership guidelines which would allow the University to accept proposals from private parties and enter into agreements with a third-party that provides construction and capital financing.

It should be noted that it is highly possible that Private Partner may require and full ownership and operational management control to protect the investment.

A project is defined as the construction and financing of a "facility" by a private partner on the university campus where the cost of the project is paid for with revenues from the project.

A project includes facilities for housing, transportation, health care, research, food service, retail sales, or student activities.

Now, for our project, the Pentaplex will be converted into a mixed-use living-learning environment, in accordance with the Board of Governor's Private Partnership guidelines.

Now, when pursuing an ITN -- invitation to negotiate -- we will have to make sure that our
safeguards against the risk of future costs or service disruptions. If there was for some reason a default or for cancellation of P-3 partnership, there has to be safeguards to not negatively affect the University's bond rating and financing that assures the facility of this project.

Looking at the project scope, our long-range goal would be to revitalize the campus for and to provide living-learning facilities that promote retention and graduation. Making this project into phases will include redevelopment of McGuinn and Diamond Halls, to modern, state-of-the-art, student affairs, Center For Access and Student Success complex.

The second phase will involve the conversion of the remaining Women's Pentaplex and Jackson-Davis with a focus on student housing, student health, parking and retail space.

To support this complex, a third phase would involve the acquisition of land and the revitalization on the main street.

Finally, the fourth phase would focus on the stadium complex, spending a post-legislative of the P-3 project approval.

Now, what does the scope mean in numbers? This could be a 210- to $225-million project, with a full
70,000 square feet of CASS building: 1400 new bed space, administrative offices, 50,000 of commercial outlets, 300 parking spaces, some site acquisition and the new 35,000-seat stadium complex.

As the project moves forward and after we have private partner and the architect engineer, the designs may of course evolve. There is a preliminary rendering of how the Pentaplex conversion could look. This is an elevation looking east from the MLK Boulevard. And to use the similar medias and architecture, that speaks not only to the old but also to the new, but have to include enclaves and open public spaces.

Just to reorient everybody, I have yet included a map of the campus here. And to the top, you see the stadium complex and you will see the complex in yellow. Again, there is a rendering of how the new stadium complex could look. It would have to build in the flexibilities of the university and the parking provisions in the rendering, we see Howard Hall and (unintelligible) on the right on the east. On the south, some retail space, like a fan shop or souvenir shop, et cetera, along the stadium as well.

Of course, just like the complete project, the financing would be a very important part of this,
which needs to be funded pending necessary approvals and authorizations. The financing could be private financing, PECO, new market tax credits, historic tax credits, and tax implement increment financing.

Based on our market analysis, the off-campus space rents around $800 to $1800, based on the square footage and amenities. Our assumption includes $900 per month, per year, for rent during a 12-month year; commercial space around $15 per rentable square feet; 30 year fixed rate debt at 4.5 percent per annum.

Preliminary cash flow numbers of 15.4 million in revenue; 7.9 million in expense with an NOI of 7.5 million; debt service of 5.8 million and a cash flow of 1.1. Again, these are all preliminary numbers; of course, it will be the financing of the private partner that determines this.

A quick look at the project timeline, which includes a preliminary programmatic phase which we are currently in; an issuance of ITN in August and September of this year; negotiations with private partners in October, November, and December; followed by the BOT; and then subsequent to BOG's approval in January or February of 2016, respectively. And then continuing predevelopment and starting the financing in next year and goes to October; and start the phase
one construction in November of 2016 with tentative
construction time of 18 months for phase one and phase
two, respectively, as 24 months for the final phase.

This is a huge undertaking and potential
impediments and challenges will be numerous. Here are
just a few of these. Starting with the P-3 guidelines
compliance with type and location of development,
legislative approvals, the P-3 complex needs for a
third-party consultant to protect our interest and
(unintelligible) of needs for subject properties to
insure private debt, potential environmental issues,
covenants and land use restrictions.

University policy changes for who needs to live
on campus, (inaudible) market for commercial
establishments, financing involved with the
commercial future student enrollment.

This has been a collaboration between many
university departments, housing, to PECO to financing
to the communications team. I really appreciate all
of their help.

Mr. Chair, this concludes the presentation.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Thank you very much.

Before I entertain any questions or comments, I
would just like to thank you for continuing all of
this work. Obviously, there is a lot of work that is
going into it and it requires a lot of collaboration. I think at the last meeting, I asked how the President felt about it, and you said you had her nod, so otherwise, I guess we could've ended the Committee right then.

But I think it's a great thing to try. Obviously, there's a lot of distance between work on this complexity on paper and on the ground. So there's obviously a lot to be done, as you have outlined, to bring us to fruition, but I commend the effort and would entertain any comments that would be directed toward you or anyone else who is involved in this.

I met from several people from your team, such as VP Miller, VP Cassidy, and the others, so I know it's a collaborative effort for what you've done to this point. And I also commend you for pointing this to us at that time so we can be aware of what's going on, and hopefully will keep us updated. It sounds like you're going to take us to 2020 to finish all of this up, so that's a lot of updates, but hopefully you will keep us included.

MR. KAPILESHWARI: Most certainly.

TRUSTEE SHANNON: So thank you for the comprehensive presentation. I just wanted to ask a
few questions.

One is, other than the proposal, reinvigorating, modernizing residential space, what other enhancements are consistent with our desire to become a 21st century living and learning environment? What are some of those other enhancements?

MR. KAPILESHWARI: Yes, absolutely. So as I said, the project is going to be broken down into multiple phases. The first one, of course, will be our student services building, the CASS building, so that way we can centralize all of the services we provide to the students, as well as a residential.

As you've mentioned, there would be some mixed-use spaces, some retail spaces so that the students can really reside on campus and have an opportunity to get whatever they need right here instead of having to leave off campus for that. There would be in-house parking, of course, and the last phase we are also trying to include the athletic side as well.

TRUSTEE SHANNON: So currently, how does our -- in the fall when we have students coming to campus and requesting dormitory space or requesting on-campus housing or campus-related housing, do we currently fall short? And does this plan take into
consideration closing that gap and then creating,
finding more students to move on campus?

MR. KAPILESHWARI: Yes, certainly. It's
basically closing the gap, and also more importantly,
improving the quality of space that we have on campus.
And I can also see if our housing director wants to
that. While he's coming over here, I'm commenting
that I would like to highlight that some of the
challenges is it would require some of the policy
changes. This will mean that we will also require the
freshman and sophomore, so two years or --

TRUSTEE SHANNON: Is that a trend? Is that
something that actually works? Do we have
benchmarking?

MR. KAPILESHWARI: It's modified information in
US News and World reports are saying that the
graduation rates and the retention improves
significantly by students living on campus.

TRUSTEE SHANNON: But what I'm asking more
specifically is, if you put a policy -- and you're
saying it would require policy change -- is that a
policy change that has been proven to work?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, ma'am. We changed
the policy last year, really. We've had this in place
for about six years, but with the enforcement last
year, so all freshman that live, whether graduated from high school or in excess of 25 miles of the University had to live on campus for the first year.

TRUSTEE SHANNON: What about sophomores, requiring sophomores to live on campus, also?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did not require them to live on campus.

TRUSTEE SHANNON: But is that what part of the policy change would --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let me restate that. There's a special group: Athletes, students that are in CEDAR ARCH (phonetic) program, and those students that are in access, full scholarships; those students are required to live on campus for two years.

TRUSTEE SHANNON: I don't want to beat a dead horse, but if we expect a policy change to be part of the success factor of this plan, I would hope that we research and find out whether or not the impact of that policy change meets our expectations, whether it's even feasible to require sophomores also to live on campus.

And just one other question. There was a slide where you showed some numbers and you showed something that translated to me -- and I'm not a numbers person but the net-net was about -- right there -- net cash
flow. And so I guess my question would be, is that net cash flow, is that a success -- I mean, that's what the results will be, but is that success in terms of the annual net cash flow, when you're bringing in revenues of 15 million?

MR. KAPILESHWARI: I'm going to request VP Miller.

VP MILLER: The debt to service ratio required by the BOG is 1.20, so you can see on the slide there there's $5.6 million in debt service. That service is -- 1400 is for housing, 50,000 square feet of commercial space, and the stadium, so that cash flow is the bottom line. So yes, the $16 million of cash flow will be a success because that will -- all of the debt service and operating expense (inaudible) expenditures from -- which is another requirement of BOG that we be self-sufficient. All of the debt service and operating costs must come from the cash flow project.

TRUSTEE WHITE: So it turns out to be seven-and-a-half, seven-and-a-half percent return. And so the issue is, quite frankly, whether that is a sufficient number for a private participant to want to pay. But I want, there's another section I'm here where you mentioned both historic tax credits and new
market tax credits. So I'm wondering, are those currently in place for the land that we're talking about or do we have to go out and make an application?

VP MILLER: We would have to make an application for both historic credits and new market tax credits. Again, this is a conceptual phase so the private developer would have an obligation to pursue those funding, but these are just types of funding that probably is available for historical tax credits because this is an historic district and it is eligible for new market credits.

TRUSTEE WHITE: And then the key is that -- so those are -- there's no assumptions made about those things in these numbers.

VP MILLER: There are assumptions made in the operating numbers, but there are in assumptions in the development performance.

TRUSTEE WHITE: Yes. And then, sort of finally -- first, let me back up and say, I'm a big fan of these sorts of activities and have seen a number of them work out quite well, so we'll research all of them. But it would also be, I think, sort of helpful in the completion of what we're thinking about, so obviously there are some facilities that currently have with beds that we don't consider
marketable. So if you could sort of just come back
and also tell us what the plan will be to deal with
those buildings as well; that would I think make this
a complete presentation.

Thank you.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Thank you.

MR. KAPILESHWARI: Absolutely. That's a very --

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Just a minute.

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Just a comment. One, you know,
clearly this is a positive, but one thing I just want
to make sure we consider, and that's dining facilities
for the students, because we've got the situation now
with 800 beds and the cafeteria being very, very
close. If we put 1400 beds or so up back on the
center of campus, now you've created another gap for
students will have to go from -- we usually refer to
it up on The Hill -- down to the new cafeteria.

Then you also have a situation of all of the
students or potential students in the Palmetto Street
complex that may or may not be on the meal plan, but
if they are, they still have quite a commute to come
up The Hill two or three times a day for their meal.
So as we're looking at this, I think it's a great idea
to revitalize that part of campus with housing, but I
think we should look at some form of accommodations
for those students so they don't have such a commute for their meals, particularly in the summer. It's a long, hot commute, whether it be from Palmetto Street or the center campus back down to 800 beds for the main cafeteria.

MR. KAPILESHWARI: Understood. And we can incorporate that and also the housing facility when we (inaudible.)

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Okay, thank you.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Mr. Chair?

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Yes, Trustee Moore.

TRUSTEE MOORE: I would like to offer comments.

It appears -- and I probably echo what's already been said -- but there are assumptions built in, and the ones that caught my attention regarding potential impediments are, from my perception, actual action items. They are need-to-change policies regarding who must reside on campus; again, that's a research piece we need to better understand, because certainly we don't want to deter students who may be interested in this University and have a two-year requirement that you live on campus.

The other is, the need to develop a clear path for future student enrollment. That's a question that raises to the forefront because we need to know
whether we're on an upward trend for an increase in numbers. And then lastly, from a business perspective, with the commercial space, ascertaining whether there is a market for it.

So I would anticipate since these are actionable that with the timeline, it looks like it's coming back before us, at least proposing January, February, that those items are in that information would have been packaged and chaired so that we can digest it.

MR. KAPILESHWARI: Absolutely, and it would give us enough time to get the department on board and get understanding from them more details.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Thank you.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: The only other item that I had a question about was the stadium complex, which you say would require some legislative approval. Do you have some plan in place to try and get that legislative approval?

MR. KAPILESHWARI: Yes. We will work on that as well. Right now, the current draft guidelines do not allow athletic facilities (inaudible) and seeing what possibilities there are.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: I didn't quite get that.

MR. KAPILESHWARI: Yeah. We've talked to the Board of Governors and the draft do not allow
athletics facilities, but they are draft guidelines.

So we will be talking after this Committee Meeting and will be of course sharing with the Board of Governors our plans and getting input as well as to how we can make this happen and what are the next best steps.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: But the legislative approval, how do you plan to go about that?

VP CASSIDY: If I can back up for just one minute and I'll get to your specific question. But what we view this is and amiss by saying, so this is essentially a feasibility study done internally with some guidance about what could a project look like and is it feasible enough from the numbers that we've been able to sort of put together to send it out, to have an invitation to potential partners who would own such a project to bid on it.

And so, most of the questions you're asking are extremely important and would be answered, I believe, in the process of the responses we get from potentially P-3 partners. And frankly, to a certain extent, I would expect the question about legislative approval to be a joint venture between that partner who theoretically would have some political capabilities and members of the Board and others who have other political ties and capabilities of
persuasion.

And so, I think from our perspective this is a feasibility study. We think "based on the numbers it's not feasible." The next step is to send out an invitation and negotiation and see who is interested in it, see what kind of criteria they would have. I think a real important question would be what are their capabilities as it relates to both getting tax credits or securing those or having influence to move those issues forward, and legislative actions.

So it's really the beginning phases of, yeah, this looks like it could be possible; "let's see who is interested in it and what their capabilities are and what they believe would be the best way to do it," and I think that also answers to a certain extent the question about dining, because it would surprise me if some of the commercial space that is proposed isn't things like fast food or Chic Filet -- although we already have one -- so other kinds of eating establishments in that area apart from whether there would be another dining hall itself.

And so again, this is really, I hate to keep using the word, but feasibility, and what we need to do is get people who have expert at this to tell us from their perspective under what circumstances would
it be feasible and what do they think, with guidance
clearly from the Board, as to what they think the
project could look like at a detail level, what it
would cost, and what the return would be.

The other thing that's in all of this is it's
clear the Board of Governors' guidelines are going to
be one of the clear guidelines that it's going to be
in there is that all of these projects ultimately have
to become property of the state; therefore, the
University. And so, there's going to be a timeline of
how long is the developer on the project and if he
will get the return on investment and how long until
the project and its properties transfer to the
ownership of the state.

So there's lots of phases to this, but from our
perspective, this is how it starts: Is it even
possible. And the next step is to put out an
invitation for negotiation to see is it something
that's interesting to those who could perhaps do it
and help finance it.

And so that's really where we are, and these are
questions, and we'll get to them all but I think
that's the process.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Thank you very much. Are
there any other questions or comments?
TRUSTEE BOYCE: I have a question. So on the project financing page and breaks it out to PECO, tax credits, et cetera; is there a goal with respect to the monetary number of each of those?

For example, of the 235 million that you think this will cost, how much do you think will be private; how much do you think will be PECO?

MR. KAPILESHWARI: Right now we had PECO for 36 phase one, but the remaining was the private financing. PECO was only 36.

TRUSTEE BOYCE: So you're saying $200 million is private financing?

MR. KAPILESHWARI: Discounting tax credit of 19 million, new market tax credit -- again, these are -- 34, conventional debt of 128 million; developer fee of 19 and PECO of 36, and all of that adds up to 238. And I have the project summary I can pass you a copy of.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Trustee Boyce, did that answer your question? You look like you still have some questions?

TRUSTEE BOYCE: I'm all right.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Any other questions or comments? This obviously is a work in progress but it's a good start, and just keep us up-to-date,
because you see, coming to the Board broadens your scope. A lot of these questions are things you might not have thought about but you will now think about.

So if there are no other questions or comments, this Committee meeting is adjourned.

(Facilities Planning Committee concluded.)
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