Bond Case Briefs

Municipal Finance Law Since 1971

A Few Lessons About Public-Private Partnerships in Higher Ed.

As many institutions look to public-private partnerships as a financing solution for their biggest and most important projects, Charles G. Renner describes some of the ins and outs.

It has been more than a decade since a report by the Institute for Higher Ed Policy first noted a worldwide shift away from public funding sources and toward private capital to finance higher education projects. The report appeared just months before the eruption of the global financial crisis that left an indelible scar on state and local public finances still seen today. The long-term effects of that crisis have only reinforced the logic that made private capital an attractive financing option in the first place.

The cold, hard fact is that available public funds for higher education have been shrinking. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a Washington-based research and policy institute, reported that 46 of 50 states "are spending less per student in the 2015-16 school year than they did before the recession." Nine of those states have seen inflation-adjusted spending declines of greater than 30 percent. On average, states are spending 18 percent less per student than before the crisis. This trend has provided little evidence of reversing.

To compensate for the funding shortfall, colleges and universities have a limited range of options. Many have decided to raise tuition, but tuition costs had been outpacing inflation for a generation prior to the crisis, and the market can bear only so much. Indeed, many institutions, particularly private ones, are already offering significant discounts off of their sticker prices to entice students to enroll. Others have opted to curb their academic programs and offerings; over the past year, many have announced downsizing and consolidation initiatives, including the elimination of majors and degree programs, intercollegiate athletic teams, and faculty and administrative positions. But such measures, too, have limited use. An institution can cut only so much without jeopardizing its ability to fulfill its mission and attract students.

Finally, some colleges and universities have increased drawdowns on their endowments, but this is more a short-term act of desperation, not the application of a long-term, sustainable financing solution. Besides, despite the cachet of the larger endowments — Harvard University sports an endowment over $37 billion — most institutions have fairly modest endowments that are little more than rainy-day funds. Last year, in a study by the National Association of College and University Business Officers, the median endowment value of an American higher education institution was $127.8 million, and 44 percent of all endowments were valued at $100 million or less.

One should also consider that the financial and risk profiles of the average American college or university have changed significantly in the past generation. Notably, many institutions have seen their debt-to-endowment ratios increase because of poor investment performance, increased drawdowns on the endowment itself or larger amounts of debt. And even those with the largest endowments are confronting new threats and challenges. For instance, in the spring of 2016, members of the Connecticut Legislature sought to tax Yale University's endowment. The idea was quickly scotched a few weeks later, but the proposal gives context to the discussion over higher education funding — colleges and universities are being squeezed because the states themselves are under financial stress.

These are the factors that have created the difficult circumstances in which higher education finds itself. It is also the reason so many institutions are looking to public-private partnerships as a financing solution for their biggest and most important projects.

The P3 Delivery Model

A public-private partnership, or P3, is long-term agreement between a public entity and a private industry team that is tasked with designing, building, financing, operating and maintaining a public facility. The past decade has seen a steady increase in the use of P3 structures, both inside and outside higher education. In 2016, something of a watershed year for P3, multiple high-profile projects came online in response to a variety of public needs, including a $1-billion-plus water infrastructure project servicing San Antonio, and a $300-million-plus renovation of the Denver International Airport's Great Hall.

The emergence of the P3 option is happening where it matters most: projects that would be otherwise unattainable under the traditional public-improvement delivery models. For instance, 10 years ago, only a handful of higher education P3 projects were up and running; today, we are approaching three dozen such projects.

The biggest challenge is, of course, the financing component, but P3 teams bring much more to the table than money — they give public entities access to expertise and innovation that can add significant value to projects at each phase of development.

Several recent higher education P3 projects demonstrate how the P3 delivery model and team approach can enable colleges and universities to take on projects they might not have otherwise been able to pursue.

Wayne State University student residential facility.

Wayne State sought out private partners for a project to demolish an existing 407-bed apartment building and replace it with new and renovated residential space. It went from issuing a request for proposals to obtaining financing in relatively record time and began leasing new beds in August 2018. To expedite construction, the private partner secured bridge financing as part of the overall capital stack, enabling the project to tap into generally favorable financing for the larger private placement of debt.

The university not only locked in favorable financing terms and paid off existing debt, but it also moved much of the worry and risk from operations onto the private partner by engaging in a full P3 approach. That includes design, construction, financing, operations and maintenance of the project over a 40-year life cycle, freeing up university resources to focus on academic and other needs.

University of California, Merced, 2020 campus expansion.

While residential projects have long been the focal point of higher education P3s, we are beginning to see more ambitious uses of the model. UC Merced 2020 is one example: a campuswide expansion covering some 219 acres and almost two million square feet of new facilities. The $1.2 billion project is likely the largest and most comprehensive P3 in American higher education. The mix of uses features academic learning, administration, research, residential and utilities, among others.

The project includes all project phases and employs an “availability” method of payment whereby the university will compensate a concessionaire directly according to a predetermined formula and schedule for the postconstruction operations and maintenance of the facilities over a 39-year life cycle.

Needless to say, a partnership of this size and scale requires solid relationships, as well as an agreement capable of accommodating changing conditions. The agreement contained flexible provisions to account for a variety of outcomes, including a 50/50 split among partners for any future refinancing gains, as well as a 50/50 split regarding potential cost-saving measures introduced by the developer.

Even when a college or university decides not to use a full P3 model, contemplating such a project often leads to a better result than only considering more traditional options. In 2014, the University of Kansas solicited private partners for a planned $350-million P3 that sought to add some 55 acres of academic, recreational, residential and utilities space to the campus. Ultimately, the university opted to create a nonprofit corporation and borrow the full project outlay from an out-of-state public finance entity rather than tapping private finance. But because the procurement process followed best practices for P3 selections, university stakeholders received the benefit of risk analyses and financial projections from multiple potential private partners, and an innovative debt-only financial approach was selected for the project.

Lessons for Other Institutions

The success of these projects suggests a few lessons for other higher education institutions. First, tapping into the full potential of the P3 model depends greatly on assembling the right partners. A well-rounded P3 team includes people with high-level expertise in private-development equity, architecture, engineering, contracting and law. Aside from the access to innovation and best-in-class skills, the team concept is important because P3 projects are long-term in nature. The relationships on which P3 projects depend will necessarily span many years; therefore, higher education participants need to carefully develop criteria for evaluating potential partners.

Also, few large-scale projects are finished without some kind of unanticipated challenge arising, so it is important to select partners who have demonstrated the stability and commitment required to see projects through to completion. Higher education administrators should study carefully their potential partners’ portfolio of projects and evaluate how each dealt with the inevitable circumstances that challenge a team’s ability to finish a project or to operate and maintain it afterward.

In addition, each of the foregoing projects had institutional champions who advocated for the P3 solution and oversaw the process through to completion. The role of champions in the P3 delivery model cannot be understated. They play a crucial role in securing buy-in for the project at the earliest possible stage and developing strategies to overcome obstacles. Establishing consensus on the campus also provides potential private partners the needed assurance to commit fully to a P3 project and helps to secure the best possible pool of P3 talent.

It is unlikely that the fiscal circumstances facing America’s colleges and universities will improve greatly over the next decade, and the competition for students is fierce. When applied competently and in the right manner, a public-private partnership allows administrators to create solutions that differentiate their campuses and brand them as places capable of getting things done. More institutions should seriously consider this option.

Inside Higher Ed

By Charles G. Renner

January 28, 2019

Bio
Charles G. Renner is a partner in the Kansas City, Mo., office of law firm Husch Blackwell LLP and is the leader of the firm's public-private partnerships practice group.