

State-Wide Capital Master Plan Sub-Committee
Ohio Board of Regents
Minutes of the Meeting of August 15, 2006

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

Alex Cofield
Andy Lechler
Ann James
Bill Wagner
Chuck Mann
Chuck Lehnert
Evelyn Frey
George Arnold
Jeff Miller
Jim Haley
Jim Haskell
Jim Nargang
John Kotowski
Karen Brockway
Kate Carey
Katie Hensel
Ron James
Stephanie McCann
Terry Thomas

The meeting started promptly at 9 am.

George Arnold of Columbus State Community College and Jeff Miller of Sinclair Community College were welcomed to the subcommittee. No nicknames were divulged.

Stephanie McCann started with a review of the HEI Facility Files, the most recent utilization report, and other reports generated from the facility files.

The subcommittee discussed how the utilization report would impact the master plan. Changes in teaching methodologies have necessitated a need to increase available square footage allocated to students. This may have an impact on the master plan.

HEI reporting of data from the institutions is influenced by the interpretation of data requirements at each campus. It is not clear how campus interpretations impact overall data quality. Campuses are very different in regard to number of buildings vs. square footage, which may also impact data quality.

Before commencing with a compression planning session, Jim Nargang reviewed a document with the subcommittee that summarized Capital Initiatives in Selected States as well as Approaches to Identifying Long-Term Needs and Costs of Renewal. Jim also reviewed a document developed by the State of Virginia in support of the implementation of an assessment database. The document compared the level of effort between a Life-Cycle Assessment vs. a Facility Condition Assessment. The last document reviewed and

discussed with the subcommittee was a NACUBO/APPA report entitled Planning for Capital Reinvestment: Alternatives for Facilities Renewal Budgeting.

After completing the review of background material, Jim Nargang started the compression planning process. Jim reviewed the Background cards and the questions the group would consider during the session. The questions the subcommittee would address during the planning session included:

- What capital policy questions do we need to address?
- What will students/parents/BOR/legislature want us to accomplish?
- What capital planning best practices do we need to examine?
- What is the capital information needs of institutions (i.e., expand HEI)?

After collecting brainstorming ideas in response to the planning questions, the subcommittee members grouped the ideas into the follow summary points:

CAPACITY

- Look at the growth potential for higher education
- Analysis of capacity as a factor for the need for additional space

MASTER PLAN or POLICY ISSUES

- Believable plan
- Demonstrate that local control is effective way to manage [statewide] capital needs
- Examine plan in terms of students, faculty & staff, and government leadership
- Examine alternative construction methods
- Develop facilities that promote greater student success
- Data uniformity and reliability

TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE

- How can technology Maximize utilization of the classroom environment?
- How should technology needs of the campuses be integrated into the plan?

SUSTAINABLE FUNDING

- Message should point to appropriateness – behavior of campuses need to be credible to legislature/OBM
- Maintain & preserve the state investment
- Create a sustainable building program for higher education
- Long term capital need defined
- Develop a plan with rationale which will provide the basis for increased support to higher education
- Follow established plan
- Statewide capital plan should reduce the need for individual institutions to fund capital [commons]

CAPITAL PLANT & OPERATIONS

- Define capital
- What constitutes our physical plant?
- Life cycle cost analysis

RESOURCE ALLOCATION

- Define all of the resources available to fund and maintain a campuses facilities
- Should we be funding depreciation?
- How much of institution resources should be spent each year?
- Compare POM expenditures between institutions
- How do we rationalize resource (state's allocation) to the plan?

FACILITIES CONDITION ASSESSMENT

- Central source for information on technology & systems at each campus
- Assessment of how deferred maintenance was determined
- Assessment of how current replacement value was developed
- Quality of classrooms and other spaces on various campuses
- There is a need to make sure utility infrastructure is an integral part of plan
- Life expectancy maintenance index
- Constituents will want to be educated (w/ hard data)
- Safe barrier free construction
- Data uniformity and reliability

Before adjourning the meeting, it was agreed that Jim would summarize the points made in a short narrative document that would be shared with the subcommittee prior to the consultation meeting on August 29th.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 pm.