



**State-Wide Capital Master Plan Sub-Committee  
Ohio Board of Regents  
Minutes of the Meeting of October 10, 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:**

Alex Cofield  
Ann James  
Bill Wagner  
Chuck Mann  
Dan Morissette  
George Arnold  
Jeff Miller  
Jim Haley  
Jim Haskell  
Jim Nargang  
John Kotowski  
Katie Hensel  
Mike Schulze  
Rich Petrick  
Ron James

**Subject Matter Experts:**

James Hunley, DAS  
Carl Rabenaldt, Parsons/3DI  
Don Rerko, URS Corporation  
Jack Probasco, Comprehensive Facilities Planning  
Jeff Homans, URS Corporation  
Kevin Rhodes, Woolpert, Inc.  
Kim Jones, Parsons/3DI  
Lisa Macklin, Comprehensive Facilities Planning  
Mike Battles, Woolpert, Inc.  
Tony Dinicola, URS Corporations

The meeting convened at 9:15 am.

Goals for the meeting:

- Confirm current draft structure for statewide assessment is a valid approach

- Determine potential costs for a contractor to conduct assessment & assist with development of final statewide plan
- Obtain feedback from subject matter experts regarding draft deliverables
- Discuss potential information needs for vendors responding to a request for services

Jim Nargang welcomed all members of the subcommittee and subject matter experts. All made introductions. Approval of the minutes from the 9/18/2006 subcommittee meeting will occur at the next meeting.

Jim Nargang introduced the subject matter experts for their presentations:

**Subject Matter Presentations - Higher Education Facility Assessments**

Overview of Assessment Methodology's: *Carl Rabenaldt, Parsons/3DI*

Conducting a Facilities Audit: *Don Rerko, AIA, URS Corporation*

Conducting an Infrastructure Audit: *Mike Battles & Kevin Rhodes, Woolpert, Inc.*

Wright State University Infrastructure Cost Study: *Jack Probasco, Comprehensive Facilities Planning, Inc*

Jim Nargang announced that the Capital Appropriations Bill would be introduced after the November elections. The Ohio Board of Regents has approved a request of 10 million as a supplemental appropriation. Regents' staff does not know if the supplemental appropriation will be approved.

**Roundtable discussion:**

- *Current Proposed Statewide Assessment*
- *Feedback on Draft Deliverables*
- *Vendor Information Needs for a Proposal Process*

The Request For Proposals (RFP) will be requested and advertised towards the end of 2006. Carl Rabenaldt stated that the RFP scope should be narrowed. The scope is wide and responses to the RFP

will be everywhere in terms of scope and price. Make sure the system that is implemented works within your system.

Mike Battles asked if this would be a RFQ? Jim Nargang stated that it would be an RFP. Kevin Rhodes stated that you need an adequate scope to compare apples to apples. Jim Nargang said that we would receive proposals first and determine a price later based on sealed bids. Also, the proposals will be based upon facility information currently available in HEI. HEI does not have a facility file for owned infrastructure.

Jack Probasco suggested we need FTE benchmarking. Coding is different by each institution type: universities, university regional campuses, community and technical colleges, and medical colleges. We need the right mix of peers to work with the right institutions to ensure you are using universal data. Also, you need some indication on what the Regents' role will be.

Jim Nargang suggested that we make our HEI database available for potential vendors to use. It would save time and money. The vendors would not have to create that data from scratch. Rich Petrick stated that much of the data is available using queries.

In regard to capacity and utilization, Chuck Mann asks how do we compare to other states? Jack Probasco added that it is a measurement of use. You have to be in the trenches to see what is going on.

Jim Haley stated that we need assistance with the assessment because we need third party evaluation and help with formulating a master plan. We need assistance in documentation.

Why do an assessment? We need to prove that we are not adequately funded to meet our needs. The data that is submitted needs to be validated by an external group or organization.

Jim Haley stated that a message of what the problem is needs to be crafted.

In response to concerns from Carl Rabenaldt that the proposed assessment as written would require three years of effort, the subcommittee accepted a proposal from Jim Nargang to split the assessment and master plan into two phases. The first phase would be the assessment effort and demonstration of total statewide capital resource need. The second phase would support development of a statewide plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:54 pm.