

**State-Wide Capital Master Plan Committee
Ohio Board of Regents
Minutes of the Meeting of August 29, 2006**

The State-Wide Capital Master Plan Committee met at the office of the Ohio Board of Regents in Columbus, Ohio. In attendance were the following:

Jim Haskell
Chuck Mann
Ron Lee
Manny Anunike
Butch Kotcamp
John Kotowski
Laura Shinn
Alex Cofield
Glen Funk
Tom Euclide
Karen Brockway
George Arnold
Ron James
Jim Nargang
Jim Haley
Robert Keller
Jeff Miller
Mike Schulze
Chuck Lehnert
Bob Waddle
Katie Hensel
Andy Lechler
Terry Thomas
Stephanie Franz
Luanne Bowman
John Jivens
Derek Bridges
Stephanie McCann
Ed Schmittgen

Jim Nargang opened up with an overview of the meeting agenda. The goals for today are:

- Review Subcommittee progress
- Reach consensus on Assessment Document

Jim passed out copies of the \$150 million Supplemental Request that was submitted to Tim Keen, OBM on June 26, 2006.

Jim Nargang reviewed a Power Point presentation describing the approved version of the Subcommittee Charter.

Tom Euclide asked how we are going to create the master plan. Jim Nargang answered that a facility condition assessment vendor would help draft the master plan. Alex Cofield noted the Subcommittee will write a story describing our current situation utilizing HEI data, and then an outside company would validate our numbers and would help create the master plan. Jim Haley emphasized our need to get our arms around what a master plan should look like. If we turned the master plan over to a vendor it wouldn't be reflective of what Ohio needs. An outside vendor will only validate the master plan.

The items currently available to develop the master plan story include a Capacity study, deferred maintenance estimates, general policy statements, and a needs statement draft.

Jim Nargang reviewed the key points from the Roundtable discussion with legislative personnel on 7/25/2006.

Key legislative perceptions:

- Overbuilding on campuses
- Inappropriate allocations of state funds (student centers)
 - Lack of understanding of local vs. State supported projects.
- Third Frontier is providing resources for campuses

Thoughts from the committee regarding the Roundtable discussion:

- Capital appropriation formula works. Don't change it. (Jim Haley)
- Understanding of new build/replacement (Alex Cofield)

Proposal Assessment

Needs

- Independent validation of capital needs
- Statewide capital master plan
- BOR-systems database based on life cycle assessment principals.
- Common systems database.
- Promote credibility with legislators and governor
- Use an industry standard
- How could BOR use the systems data?

Tom Euclide asked if there was any discussion regarding best practices on how to distribute the funds wisely. BOR's capital funding policy allows for campus decisions regarding how to use state capital resources. BOR is a coordinating body and has little authority to direct campus allocation decisions

Approach

Deliverables

FCA and Systems Database supported with \$10 million supplemental request.

E & G space & technology
No time boundary around 'past' need.

We need pictures of space needing renewal.

Debt levels

- State vs. local.

Capture balance of allocation

Jim Haley for Miami University indicated the institution uses a 47 year cycle for new or renovated buildings. We need a statement about the average life of different types of facilities across the state.

Proposal Assessment

- Approach
 - \$10 Million Supplemental Request Break-Out
 - \$8.5 Million for a Facility Condition Assessment
 - Systems Database- \$1.5 Million

The subcommittee reviewed the Proposed Assessment in Support of a Statewide Capital Master Plan for Ohio's Public Higher Education Institutions. Alex Cofield indicated her comments were designed to separate the assessment vs. the master plan. Jim Nargang explained the primary purpose of this document is to justify BOR's request to legislative members for the \$10 million study.

Based on the discussion of the consultation group, it was agreed that consultation members would review the Proposed Assessment document relative to the group discussion. It was agreed to have comments back to Jim by September 13th for the next subcommittee meeting on September 18th.

A consensus was reached that the subcommittee should prepare an RFP/RFI for the assessment. Jim was asked by Alex Cofield to create a draft and share it with the whole group for feedback when the subcommittee meets again.