



**State-Wide Capital Master Plan Sub-Committee
Ohio Board of Regents
Minutes of the Meeting of September 18, 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
Ann James
Chuck Mann
Evelyn Frey
George Arnold
Jim Haley
Jim Nargang
John Kotowski
Karen Brockway
Katie Hensel
Ron James
Stephanie McCann
Daniel Klett
Derek Bridges

The meeting convened at 9:08 am.

Minutes from the 7/25, 8/15, and 8/26 meetings were approved.

There are three goals for this meeting:

1. Reach consensus on Proposed Assessment Document
2. Review Capacity Report update
3. Solicit feedback on RFQ draft

Discussion to reach consensus on Proposed Assessment Document:

Jim Haley asked how can we show how or who is using what strategies and mechanisms for institutional debt levels.

Chuck Mann: asterisk next to the approach section. IT departments on campuses would say they need 10 times the schools annual budget to be brought current with technology.

Ohio Supercomputer Center is a shared resource for Ohio. A portion of the cap allocation should be earmarked for other investments.

Jim Haley suggested that we change the order of the benefits. Jim Nargang said that it wasn't put together with a priority order, but could be perceived that way.

Document proposed facilities and infrastructure assessment in support of a statewide capital master plan for Ohio's public higher education institutions.

Jim Haley disagreed with the 10 year master plan and stated that we need to focus on the development of a sustainable master capital plan: 50, 100, or 150 years possibly.

Alex Cofield agreed. What is meant by a master plan? We all need to be on board to have the best discussion possible.

Jim Haley asked how credible is the data? And if validated, how will it maintain credibility in the future?

Building aging is predictable... we need to request funding to address that predictability.

We need to compare our assessment vs. K-12.

Alex Cofield asked is the systems database negotiable? The database is a BOR issue and are there other reasons why the Regents want this data?

Jim Haley stated that the facility assessment is not to increase the pot, but to protect the pot.

To what level of detail do you want the facility assessment to show to the legislators.

How do we deal with infrastructure? The model needs to be the same.

A review of the Capacity Report was led by Stephanie McCann.

All Tables are draft versions and not available to the public.

Table 1: FY 2005 Classroom Space analysis – Total Classroom Space

Table 2: FY 2005 Classroom Capacity Calculations Using Satisfactory & Minor Rehab Classroom Space

Table 3: FY 2005 Class Laboratory Space Analysis – Total Class Laboratory Space

Table 4: FY 2005 Class Laboratory Capacity Calculations Using Satisfactory & Minor Rehab Lab Space

Table 5: FY 2005 All Office Space Capacity for Campus & University Staff

Table 6: FY 2005 SA and MI Office Space Capacity for Campus and University Staff

RFQ Draft – initial comments and discussion.

Initial thoughts were that the RFQ will need more work.

We will advertise in the Ohio Register. We need to target the end of December to make the January advertising deadline.

The list on page three moved the request in different directions regarding the deliverables.

Next Scheduled Meetings for Subcommittee: October 10th and November 10th

Meeting was adjourned at 3:09 pm