

**State-Wide Capital Master Plan Sub-Committee
Ohio Board of Regents
Minutes of the Meeting of July 25, 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:

Subcommittee Members

Jim Haley
Kate Carey
James Nargang
Alex Cofield
Ron James
Evelyn Frey
Ann James
Chuck Mann
John Kotowski

Katie Hensel, Ohio Board of Regents
Derek Bridges, Office of Budget and Management

House Republican Caucus

Dan Baker, Research & Policy Aide, Budget
Carrie Colosimo, Research & Policy Aide, Higher Education

House Democratic Caucus

John Singleton, Research & Policy Aide
Sara Hall Phillips, Research & Policy Aide

Senate Republican Caucus

Matt Whatley, Legislative Aide, Sen. Carey
Brian Perera, Finance Director
Tom Walsh, Deputy Director of Finance

Senate Democratic Caucus

Matt Smydo, Legislative Aide, Sen. Zurz
Louis Capobianco, Finance Director

Meeting started at 9:05

Jim Nargang welcomed Jim "Hacksaw" Haskell, University of Akron to the subcommittee.

Minutes from June 19, 2006 subcommittee meeting were approved.

The Charter that was created at the 6/19/2006 Subcommittee meeting was discussed and approved with minor changes.

The roundtable discussion with legislative staff began after the charter discussion. Everyone in attendance introduced themselves and described their higher education affiliations.

Jim Nargang discussed the background document and the list of questions that he passed out.

Deborah Gavlik presented a summary of both the Commission on Higher Education (CHEE) and the Economy report and the Higher Education Study Funding Council (HESFC) report. The CHEE report made several recommendations that could have an impact on the final statewide master plan. The principal recommendation from the HESFC report was a third party validation of higher education's capital need.

The CHEE report was on the table to be discussed but was not reviewed by the legislative staff before the meeting. It was agreed that we will discuss this at a future meeting.

Relative to the HESFC recommendation, the roundtable group discussed utilizing the \$10 million Supplemental Request for an assessment study. Legislative caucus members suggested the consultation be clear about how the \$10 MM would be spent. Without a clear justification, it would be difficult for members of the legislature to support this request. Brian Perera pointed out that legislators may want to put the funds toward renovations instead of a study.

Jim Haley posed a question to the roundtable group regarding how we will gain credibility. Brian Perera suggested we provide a needs assessment vs. a wish list. Carrie Colosimo agreed with Brian that a study is necessary.

After the roundtable discussion, Stephanie McCann discussed the highlights of the Capacity Study. The report would be updated with current facilities data by early September. It was agreed that the subcommittee will review the updated report at our September meeting.

Andy Lechler discussed the cost to renovate report: The report reviewed focused on Educational and General space only. The report was run in 2004 and again in 2005. The subcommittee suggested the cost to renovate report be posted to the capital web site. Before a final decision was made regarding posting the information, Jim Nargang would share the report with the subcommittee members.

After lunch, the subcommittee scheduled meetings through the end of the calendar year.

Schedule future meetings:

Sub-Committee

August 15th

September 18th

October 10th

November 10th

Committee

August 29th

October 24th

December 12th

The subcommittee discussed the following items relative to the caucus roundtable:

- We need justification for the 10 million supplemental request.
- The State of Ohio will not be able to address the entire deferred maintenance problem. The master plan will need to address this reality.

The subcommittee discussed the following regarding the next and future meetings:

- At a future point, the subcommittee/consultation meetings need to include a BOR public relations staff person who is versed in the issues relating to the master plan.
- Each subcommittee member would go back to their respective campus to determine if staff can be made available for an on-site assessment. Jim Nargang would also survey campuses to determine the ability of campuses to support an on-site assessment team.
- Each subcommittee member will ask the person on campus who completes the facility file submissions what information was used to report. It is not clear at this point how consistent the information is from campus to campus.
- The master plan needs to have a broad based discussion on the different avenues of funding maintenance and capital projects. Some items to consider at future meetings include cost management, state subsidy and availability of local resources, capital component funds, and basic renovations.

Jim Nargang suggested the subcommittee's task for the next meeting would be to develop the justification for the \$10 MM study. In preparation for the next meeting, Jim would provide a document describing the assessment types and methodologies.

After reaching agreement on the need for the justification, the meeting was adjourned.