MINUTES

DATE | September 19, 2018
--- | ---
FACILITATOR(S) | Libby Ramirez
MINUTES TAKEN BY | Recorded
ATTENDEES | Anita Azarenko, Bill Callendar, Deborah Correa, Dan Dowhower, Lori Fulton, John Gremmels, Kate Hunter-Zaworski, Joe Majeski, Gabe Merrell, Carl Metz, Susan Padgett, Libby Ramirez, Bob Richardson, Sara Robertson, Patrick Robinson, Marion Rossi, Brandon Trelstad, Meredith Williams
VISITORS | Bob Richardson, University Land Use Planning Manager effective October 18th Attending meeting today as an observer and in a transitional role

INTRODUCTIONS

Libby Ramirez introduced herself to the committee. She is the University Architect and Manager of Capital Resources. Since Dave Dodson’s retirement transitionally taking over leadership of this meeting until our new University Land Use Planning manager is seated and on staff and ready to go.

- Introduction of Bob Richardson, University Land Use Planning Manager effective October 18th Attending meeting today as an observer and in a transitional role
- Meetings stay on target; meet on a regular basis; Bob will take over leadership of meeting once he is in place and caught up; Bob and the committee will run meetings as they see fit as part of a group effort

Committee Members and guests:

- Libby Ramirez: Working at OSU for 3 years and in her role as University Architect for 2 years
- Bob Richardson: City of Corvallis for about 10 years and was liaison to CPC while in that role; in 2014 began work for City of Albany as Planning Manager; excited to be at OSU and part of the good work here and looking forward to getting to know everyone better
- Bill Callendar: with Recreational Sports; part of committee for a while; on-campus for 25 years
- Carl Metz: City of Corvallis Associate Planner; city liaison for committee
- Deborah Correa-OSU Foundation, Director of Stewardship; this is first meeting attending; in her role she has worked with a lot of the capital project managers on donor recognition in the building
- Kate Hunter-Zaworski: Professor in Civil Engineering; participate as part of Faculty Senate; part of committee for a while; expertise in accessibility and inclusivity of people with disabilities
- Dan Dowhower: Works as OSU but is a community representative from Corvallis; lives on only house adjacent to OSU property at 9th and Madison
- Gabe Merrell: Equal Opportunity and Access ADA Coordinator; part of committee for many years; on-campus for 8 years
- Marion Rossi: College of Liberal Arts Associate Dean; part of committee for many years; at OSU for a long time
- Anita Azarenko: University Facilities, Infrastructure and Operations Associate Vice President; current role for 3 years; OSU for 32 years
- Meredith Williams: Transportation Services Director; at OSU for 5 years
• Patrick Robinson: University Housing and Dining Assistant Director Capital and Space Planning; part of committee for 3 years; OSU for 11 years
• Lori Fulton: Capital Planning and Development head of design and construction team
• Brandon Trelstad: Sustainability Office;
• Susan Padgett: Campus Planner
• Sara Robertson: Associate Campus Planner
• John Gremmels: Capital Planner

Sign-in sheet passed around for everyone to sign-in.

PROJECT/CONSTRUCTION UPDATES

Libby Ramirez gave updates on the following projects:

• Forest Science Complex (FSC) is back in construction. Zone 3 is the part that connects back to Richardson Hall will have a roof on it by end of month. Zones 1 and 2 are back to the replacement of panels. Still in negotiation regarding the number of panels to be replaced in the building but we are moving forward in a positive way and making good progress. Project was slated to be completed fall/winter of 2019/2020. Still fine-tuning these dates based on number of panels being replaced. (Update provided by Libby)

• Advanced Wood Product Lab is the high bay laboratory space adjacent to as part of the FSC. Low bay/office/composite lab portion is completely enclosed and nearly has a roof on it. The high bay portion is starting. As you drive down Washington Way, you can see the structure going up. You can see the tall reaction wall, which is the concrete wall that is not the height of the building it will go a little higher than that. They are starting to stand the glue lam beams that will enclose the high bay portion. This project will be finished late summer/early fall 2019. This will be completed prior to FSC. (Update provided by Libby)

• Lower Campus Housing will likely make a Board request for total project cost of $50M. The nature of housing changed from traditional resident facility to studios based on market analysis that would address needs of underrepresented population that is the upper division/graduate housing population. Based on that population, increase of square footage from original request from a few years ago and escalation the request to the Board of total project budget request of $50M in October. (Update provided by Anita)
  ▪ Two text amendments-- enable to build housing unit in this area
    ❖ Codify current monitoring process with the City-been doing the process for a few years but never formally approved through text amendment process. Language revised and initiated process with City and is in review.
    ❖ Land development code that will enable us to expand square footage that can be built in area as well as swap open space from sector D to enable us to build the project on east side of campus. Initiated this week with the City the sector allocation changes to determine whether the city council will review it or not. Favorable reviews to initiate process.
      o Clarification—this text amendment will transfer development allocation from Sector B to D and open space allocation from Sector A to D. There is no increase in development square footage of campus just transferring from one sector to another. This is not precedent setting. OSU remains 51% open space, which meets the criteria of the land development code.
  ▪ Question—Has there been a substantial change in what the committee approved years ago to what it is now? Have you changed the footprint?
Number of beds have not increased. Proposed wide range of 200-400 beds in original proposal.
Square feet—original request was 100-125k square feet and it is now at 125,000 square feet
Since last met with there has not been any substantive changes other than trying to address the aesthetic architectural features the committee talked about
Previous discussion regarding Parking/Bike Usage/Bike Parking. Assuming there is an update down the road. Spring meeting provided an update with no substantive changes. Accommodate bulk of parking on-site and additional parking at a different location. There is 285 bike parking spots planned outside of the facility with 50% covered required. Also looking to have the cover biked parking area enclosed and secured for the residents to hopefully incentive them to use it more. Maybe Pedal Corvallis might have a station there. They have talked to Meredith about it the opportunity. Secured bike parking outside of the building is a change from before. Had conversations and clarification on understanding of bike parking provided for the site that some of it can be restricted for use by residents, which is the preference to ensure the investment goes to the students as primary use of location. There will also be plenty of parking for visitors with some covered parking not just the secured, covered parking area.

- Question: You said that the tenant bike parking is not covered.  Answer: It will be. Required to provide one parking space for a bike per unit in the facility. We will have 286 bike parking locations. Requirement not sure if it is City code or Campus code that at least 50% of them need to be covered and our preference is to have as much of the bike parking also be enclosed and secured for the residents. Will maintain some for non-residents.
  - Note: May 16 meeting minutes has a great deal of text about commentary from that meeting.
- Opportunity to review campus standard for secured bike parking like a cage or design and material to be used

Lori Fulton gave update on following project:
- Strategic Framework Plan: Started work on a physical development strategy, which will be a companion document to university’s Strategic Plan 4.0. Have hired a firm named Perkins and Wills which is a national architectural planning firm with a focus on higher education work. We are working with people from the Seattle office. The process began about a month ago. Brought together six what is called resource groups that represent academics, administration, athletics, recreation, student affairs, transportation, and another group. There is a Steering committee as well made of associate deans and that executive level. There is also an Executive report to the upper administration. Project is going take about 1.5 years. Hope do is with input from as many people we can get and a big part of this next section of the work is going to be outreach. How are we going to do it? What should this campus look like with ten years as the framework. We are asking people to look beyond that to 30 years. What should physically this campus look like? Buildings, parking, drop-off spaces, landscaping, height, and trees, etc. We look forward to bringing back information as we gather it to this group because you are important participants. We will be working with other committees such as the Infrastructure Working Group (IWG) and some others as we start pulling all the information together. First time we have done this and we are excited about it. It is a broad scope but it is important work. This group will be critical as we define this as a collaborative group with Perkins and Wills. Part of the charge is the campus-planning environment and expect that this group will be called up
outside of meetings to do critical work for this team. It is not a campus master plan as it is described at OSU. That term has been used at other institutions that reflect a strategic framework plan but it is not a regulatory document. It is not a piece of a comprehensive plan for the city. It is a visioning document for the university for the next ten to thirty years.

- What degree does the work Kittelson did last year play into this? Transportation information will be part of this framework. There are several studies that will be part of the overview that the consultants receive. Facilities assessments and transportation plans and others plans we are working on right now. As those projects are completed, we will provide that information to Perkins and Will. Sightlines work will continue. There may be refinement of buildings. Facilities and Capital Planning was the sixth focus group brought together to talk about deferred maintenance issues.

Sara Robertson gave an update on the following projects:

- **Transportation Plan:** Working with Kittelson and Associates for more than a year but consistently the last year on a Transportation Plan. They are feverishly finishing a draft and sending bits and pieces this week. We circulate a draft to other campus stakeholders next week for comment. A draft of a final plan by end of October.

- **Other Transportation issues happening this Fall:**
  - Parking utilization study to fill our monitoring requirements with the City including our management of those facilities as well.
    - Occurs every fall
    - Conducted third to sixth week of fall term starting the week of October 15
  - Traffic operations study
    - Occurs the fourth week of October of fall term the week of October 22.
    - Two counts of intersection turn movement counts of our 28 intersections required to report to the City that we do in lieu of base transportation model.

Other Project Updates:

**Magruder Hall (Libby)**

- **Magruder Hall** (Update by Libby) Under construction and moving forward. It is on schedule that it intended to be on. They have broken ground and moving forward with construction.

**Steam Tunnel (Update by Anita)**

- Celebrate the tunnel. For a year, we were all holding our breath that we would not have a major catastrophe that the steam line would fail. We have a great tunnel so you should take a tour with Joe or someone. We have redundant steam line underneath the road, easy access, the road is great with lighting, and sidewalks are wonderful. It is infrastructure but something to celebrate. You will need to watch a video for training before taking the tour. For anyone that does not know. There was a 24-inch direct bearing steam line that was compromised not too long after construction seven years in. It failed. There was no redundant feature. Every other part of campus is redundant; there are loops throughout the campus. This main feed did not have that. We now have two-18” inch pipes in the tunnel so one could be shut-off and still have one for main feed to campus. Service any issue or problems while one is still running. It gives a sense of relief as it should be. In a perfect world, there would be two tunnels.
**MEETING MINUTES – MAY 16, 2018**

Meeting Minutes Approval

- May 16 meeting minutes provided to attendees. Since being new to the process, Libby is not sure if meeting minutes were typically sent out prior to the meeting or brought to the meeting for review. Response: Prior to the meeting. Suggestion to Bob from Libby:
  - Prefer and make a suggestion that we set up a folder within a Box file or drop box that each member downloads. Then it is not attached to an email or calendar invite. There are no opportunities for it to be lost. If you are sitting at your laptop, you are able to pull it up and review in the meeting. We will investigate that and upload PDF files then you can download them.
  - Committee review minutes at meeting. If there are any questions or any concerns, we can bring them up. Discussion regarding minutes needing to fill in some of the blanks regarding unintelligible comments.

Motion to table review of the May 16, 2018 meeting minutes by Bill Callendar.
Motion seconded by Marion Rossi.
Motion passes.

**MAGRUDER HALL PET SCANNER TRAILER (ACTION REQUIRED)**

Susan Padgett presented the options.

- Vet Med wants to locate a PET scanner trailer at their facility. It is a temporary facility. They have something similar located on the west side of the building. Requested a site larger than the actual trailer. There is a heritage tree located there that conflicts with their preferred location. The secondary location would require planning office to modify the development agreement with the City for the Magruder project so parking will need to be relocated, which is problematic. Planning chose a third site, which is on the West side of building that is a bit of a compromise but is already paved; does not conflict with vehicle movement; does not displace parking spaces. That site is approved and is not one that they had requested. They had two preferred sites. Do not know if that is going to satisfy their need. They may come back with a different request.
  - Question: Have you had a conversation with John Doty the project manager? Yes, have spoken a lot with John. Libby’s understanding is that site 3 did not have budget implications for the project. Yes, that is important too. Site 1 conflicts with the heritage tree. Site 2 require screening from Washington Way. It is a very tall semi-trailer that would require very tall screening and has a budget impact. Putting it on the west side of building is out of sight.
    - Additional comment from Kate: Typically, when we have projects like this come through we have someone from Vet Med in the room so they can answer questions. Question is around the functionality, which is not addressed and only see a fact that there is an object and you are trying to place it. What I do not see addressed is from the utility and functionality of this particular device. Sometimes you are dealing with chemicals, sometimes you are dealing with in this case electrons and stuff. Patient transfer might be an issue. Question that I would feel more comfortable is if someone from Vet Med here to answer the questions that this is Site 3. Yes, we can do this from a performance functional perspective because to me this is completely lacking. You are just looking at the physical
set. A PET scanner you are moving patients in and out. They might be four-legged and furry but are due respect. I would just feel more comfortable before giving final approval that someone from Vet Med answer and address the functionality of the different sites.

- Other committee member comments: I would agree with Kate on that. Just looking at where they wanted it sited is near the small animal hospital and where it would be sited is near the large animal hospital. While it is not in legal conflict with movement of vehicles, it is a lot of horse trailers back there. If you are moving small critters, you are moving them through the large animal hospital to get to the pet scanner.

- Response from Susan: The request was for the first option because they have a lot of radiology up there and it is a similar use. I am not sure if the relationship is the size of the patient or locating of similar facilities. Committee member responses: It would be easy access for both large and small clinic. They currently have a MRI in a similar type of trailer located in the same area as being proposed for the PET scanner. Clarifying question: By Site 3 there is a trailer? Response: Yes, there is an MRI trailer very similar to this in a similar location. You can see it in the site proposal. The Corvallis Clinic for years you had to traipse outside for an MRI so we are used to this. I just want to make sure that there is some thought and that they sign off on this.

- Question from Libby to Sara and Susan: In your conversations with John, is there an opportunity for us to go back and ask these questions to get further information or are they on a timeline that is important? Response from Sara: My understanding is that Site 3 was discussed. This is hard because I am speaking on behalf of Rebeeca who had first encounter on this project with Vet Med and is out on medical leave right now. My understanding is that they were aware that we were going to recommend Site 3 and that it could work for them but it was not their first preference and it is due to the distance from the small animal clinic. I do not know about timeline. Libby comment: Recollects that all three sites had been discussed with Vet Med. Although Site 3 is not their preference, it is acceptable. That is where I am concerned that perhaps that has changed. In last conversation with John Doty, Site 3 was acceptable just not their preference but preference from project management side because it met the budget requirements. I feel like we need some resolution and we need answers to questions. I feel we need to go back, ask those questions, and come back to this one at our next meeting. Clarifying question from Sara: Is the question is this the preferred site or is will this work for you? I am not exactly sure how to qualify it. Response from committee member: There are two questions. 1) We want reassurance that Site 3 will meet their clinical performance needs. Not just that we are going to park the trailer here because that’s the way it is. Reassurance from them that this is not their first choice but that they think it will work. It would be helpful to know with the considerations to the needs of the clients that are moving back and forth. Response from Sara: I believe we have asked that but will double check with them. 2) Next part of the question. We only meet every quarter. I think that is too much to ask them to say we are going to table it to the next meeting. I am not happy with that. You want to get the project moving. If we can figure out some way to not have another meeting but do a vote by mail to move things along. I don’t want to stop progress just because we want questions answered.

- Suggestion that we consider eliminating some spaces before we even make them options. For example the heritage tree. Clarifying response by committee members: I think what we are saying is that options 1 and 2 are not options. Was option 2 not an option or did it
have more logistics and more expense? It had the screen issue but also the issue of enclosing the heritage tree.

- We would consider a conditional approval that upon agreement from the department that our approval stands with choice 3. I would like to see what Kate was asking for a statement about this meets our needs and how it meets their needs signed off by the Dean. Consider a conditional approval with statement from the Dean in one week’s time? Concurring on the recommendation and agreeing with them. Heads are nodding in agreement. If they had been in the room, which is typical. They could have addressed all of these questions.
  - Kate Hunter-Zaworski: Motion to move that we have conditional/provisional approval pending production of assurances from the Dean of the College of Vet Med that Site 3 meets their requirements.
  - Deborah Correa: Second the motion.
  - All those in favor—verbal “Aye”
  - Any opposed—no response

Action: We will get that assurance from Dean Tornquist and send out to all those in attendance as well as to those not in attendance. It will be put in the Box folder that we create so people can have access. We will set that up and make sure everyone can access it first before we start putting documents there.

### Other Business

Anita provided a Board of Trustee Update:

- Talked about the housing project and capital budget request for that.
- Every fall we will be presenting a capital project status report. The Board is requesting that we give a report on those that we have completed, those that are in process, and those that are likely to be preceding in a specified amount of time. We are doing that at the next Board meeting.
- Proposing new capital projects process for consideration by the Board. The process we are going to propose them that we already vetted with them this last June is that the only capital projects that will advance are those on the capital forecast. The capital forecast is a ten-year view of what is possible. It is forecast not a plan. It is dynamic. It can change annually. It still is a lot of thinking of can we do this project? The kind of thinking that primarily goes into it is primarily what are the sources of fund that are going to find this project. We have finite capacity in certain areas so we have to make sure that whatever we are proposing we are not putting the university at risk for not having enough cash, not being able to pay the debt. This forecast is put through a financial modeling platform and looks at the impact of debt policy ratios that the Board requires to at least stay within the ranges. Those ranges are set so we can maintain our credit ratings and actually qualify for a bond. The forecast is the first step. Nothing advances into consideration for capital projects unless it is on the forecast with the exception of emergencies. For example: if we had the steam line blow up in this process and it is not on the forecast. We are not going to say would ten years; we are not going to fix this. All of a sudden, it would show up on the forecast and it is going to be something we are going to do. If we have an opportunity we cannot refuse, it could put something on the forecast. That would be a president’s decisions. The President would decide and make a recommendation to the Board that this particular project should be on the forecast. It is likely to be a very rare event, if at all. Once it is on the forecast, it will have two stage gates. The first stage gate will occur after
we have completed or towards the end of schematic design. The reason we want a stage gate at this point is because we need to have very clearly defined scope on the capital budget. Clearly defined so as we move forward, regardless if the price goes down or price goes up we have a fixed scope so we can make informed decisions. We can give up scope if it has gone up. If prices go down, we are not going to increase the cost of that project to come up to what was allocated for it. Up through schematic design will basically set the scope and give us an initial estimated budget at a high level. That then will be presented to the Financial and Admin committee of the Board of Trustees. At that time, we will present the project, scope, cost and what potential risks are associated with that project. We will explain contingencies we factored into the project in light of the nature of the project. If we do another novel construction, we may put higher contingency into the project. If we are doing a simple dormitory, we may not use as high of a contingency. We will explain those risks. Once the F&A Committee sees that, they are going to say Yes/No. Let’s assume it is yes. It has gone through that stage gate. The next stage gate is somewhere after design development or during construction documents. At that point, we are getting closer to setting guaranteed maximum price and we have a good feeling as to what the project budget is. At that stage gate, we would be asking for the capital budget request for that project. We have addressed the risk, know of any new risks that have arisen and we would know the total project cost and now you can begin construction. You will not begin construction until you have approval for total budget. That’s the new way of thinking and I assume it is going to make its way through Board since that is what was discussed in June.

- The other thing we are putting in front of the board is the possibility of having a variance. If the project comes in over, the VP for DFA up to a certain percentage would be able to give the permission to proceed without board approval. It varies across the country between 5-15% variance. We are putting it out there; we are going to shoot high with a 15% variance with Mike having authority to say yes/no to proceed or $5M whichever is greater. Right now board approval is required of $5M project or higher. $5M is the benchmark. Anything below that and within the 15% variance, Mike will approve or inform the Board that he has agreed to move the project forward.
- We will not be doing regular, predictable capital budget requests it is going to be based on the actual life cycle of the construction project. We will no longer be on a fixed timeline. It will be based on the stage gates. There will be no annual capital budget. It will be based specifically on projects.
- Question: Is Athletics part of this or are they separate? Response: The capital forecast includes all auxiliaries and Cascades.
- Committee member: You are requiring a lot of investment in costing to get to your stage gates. So for a lot of these projects even before they get to go forward. Is there a pool of funding to support the development to potentially get to a “no” vote? Response: Yes, typically those would be unit funds that would support the advancement of that particular project. For example, we have a STEM building. I am making this up. The College of Science is going to build a $30M building. They would advance through gift funding or whatever the initial programming cost. Committee member: You are looking to the development to the bankers.
- Question: In developing these projects, it is not just construction. You are looking at a full life cycle. A 50-year or 100-year life cycle costing? Response: 50 years for buildings. What do you mean? Committee member: When you are looking at not just the cost of building that building but operating that building for 50 years as part of the package. Response: As part of the business forecast, that is factored in. When you have an amount put for a particular building in the forecast. Sherm includes operating cost for any increase in square footage or change the dollar pes square foot if function changes. For example, on the forecast is Gilbert Hall. It is a Chemistry building right now. Basically a failed Chemistry building. If we renovate that, we would not likely renovate to a Chemistry building. The cost could go down for that building versus what they are now if we were doing costing based on function. Sherm for every new construction he factors in increases. If we change the function and the cost goes up for that function, he increases the cost per square footage. He assumes certain ratios in enrollment. The business forecast is operating and capital. He is
incorporating all that into looking at what the impact on the debt policy ratio. We do not include there prescriptive deferred maintenance or capital renewal amounts based on building. What we are including is within nine years $45M annually to covered deferred maintenance. Some point in time that dollar amount is an investment amount for systems renewal. Right now, we are playing catch up because we have $650M worth of deferred maintenance. Hopefully, we get to a point in which and Sightlines would say it is about $45M of recurring investment that is needed for the University. We are not currently setting that money aside for system renewal. Committee member: Some of the maintenance which we talked about in this committee or Faculty Senate, some of the daily care of buildings there is some neglect that we are seeing. We don’t have enough set aside for general “housekeeping”. I live in a building that windows have not been cleaned in 15-20 years. Reason I am asking this is that it gets back to the design of a building. There are buildings that are easier to take care of and maintain. Kelley is a great example of one expensive nightmare. It is a beautiful building and it is LEED but it is a very expensive building. This is where it is coming from to make sure we are being good stewards of things moving forward. There is the maintenance and the general housekeeping. Response: I believe you are singing Joe’s tune in simplicity of maintenance. He is probably saying “yay! Someone else is saying it.” Response by Joe: The good news is we have received additional funds recently that we are trying to target to specific things like that. We are not extremely happy with our current custodial contractor and looking at other options. Whatever those other options be whether doing business differently. We intend to put money into windows this year. You are right they have not been done 15-20 years. That many years it was said here’s a great way to save money and we are not doing that. Cut it out and we could do it again in two years. Two years never came or it came and went. We have some building such as Cordley that we legally could not clean the windows because they were covered in asbestos dust from the caulking around the window. Then it is like “okay, now we have some real problems.” Now Cordley is being dealt with. Our discussions with Anita and Mike green and others, is how do we take the money we do have and target specifically the needs of the campus customer in reliability, redundancy, and aesthetics which is recruiting retention. That’s our plan to work toward this year. That’s a balancing act because we have $650M worth of deferred maintenance and where does that money come from. It comes from the E&G CIR funds but it also comes from O&M. When things finally fail and we are in a crisis mode, where is it going to come from? Question: Is the $650M deferred or is it modernization? Response: Is it deferred. Comments: So the real number is much bigger. Yes, much bigger because it does not include seismic renewal. We are probably talking about $1.3B. That number inflates and grows with time. It is a tough target. Question: Does it include accessibility? Have there been estimates as to when those lines are predicted to converge and start using those funds differently especially if you are talking about the $650M? Response: In ten years, what I can say is from Sightlines if we have not done anything we would be at about $820M deferred maintenance, non-capital renewal. With the investment strategy that hopefully will hold with E&G funds being set aside, we actually start bending the curve down to about $400M at the end of ten years. We cut it in half. Comments: It is long a time. There is still deferred maintenance. Things are still getting older. You cannot go past failed. At a certain point, it is failed and it is not turning down anymore. On that note in the failed area, do you have as part of this long-term plan that you are working on like Snell and Weniger? I will present the forecast to you in preparation for the January Board meeting. In the forecast right now, Snell is slated for demolition. There is also movement at this point a draft has campus operations moving from south Kerr to OSU Foundation and building out an operations center over there. That will enable us to demolish those building as well as take care of an underground tank issue in the area. Weniger is slated in 16-18 years to be demolished because it is not worth renovating or rebuilding. Question: Do you think we could have a meeting of this committee at some point maybe in January to get the roadmap? Response: I would say it is before that because I need to get the docket in usually the week before Christmas. Before Thanksgiving, I should have something that has been well vetted. So perhaps by the December meeting we could review that? Yes, because the Infrastructure
Working Group is working on prioritizing then Capital Finance Working group which is our finance people will look at it and vet it then it goes up to Leadership. It does not have to happen right now so this would be a great to share with you what our thinking is and anything that is a red flag it would be good know. Plan for the full two hours for the December meeting. It would be a wonderful work session. If we need more time, we schedule a morning or something too. Meredith has had her hand up for a while. Question: One last question on the capital process that you were describing. Is there a dollar threshold under which it would be a minor capital project? Response: Yes, $5M. Question: Is there going to be a process for those that are close to $5M but escalate over it? Response: I think it is going to be $5M and that will trip Board approval. If you have a $4.8M project and it is going over, it will need Board approval. That is my guess. Comments: It is more Housing specific. We are looking to bundle in groups to collectively do it whether based on investment on building or other investment. The other thing we need to mindful we are not creating capital projects under $5M so it does not need to go to the Board. That is silly. As long as we have the means and capacity, let’s go to the Board. If we do, ten rooms and we are doing together because we are going to save money. I think we present it as a project. If you are thinking of doing that, I need to get it on the forecast. Question: Clarification on the deferred maintenance piece. Response: Correct. The current major buildings we have on inventory. For the new construction, are there plans in place to include maintenance fees? Response: Yes. Comments: We have a stewardship fund that is attached to every new construction not major renovation. 10% of direct construction cost is set aside in this fund. That does not cover all system renewal but it helps. In early estimates we might need somewhere between 16-18%. We are little more than halfway there. It will be tied to the building. Question: When did we start doing that? Response: We have been doing it for as long as I have been in this full-time job. Question: Who has discretion of those funds? Is it Joe or the department? Response: That is basically, us. It is our responsibility for the renewal.

OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS:

- It might be useful and this could be done email or at the next meeting. The Community Hall slope study that a number of us have been involved in, it will be finished by December. We could show the visuals of what we are looking at. We hired an architect to study the community slope down to 14/15th for accessibility. They have been sketching out some schematic designs for us that look nice. Comment: I would love to hear how that is integrated in the transportation system plan.

- The Foundation has moved to Research Way. We moved in a week ago Monday. Question: What happened to your building? Response: The University has taken it back over and you will be moving other people into it. I think refurbishing is going to take about a year. Comment: What is moving into the Foundation building is the Campus Operations Center. That will be Capital Planning and Development, Facilities Services, and Transportation Services. There would be shop construction to accommodate Facilities. Be sure to get a new roof. It is already on the list. How is your new space? It is lovely but there are a lot of ladders and construction workers still all over the place. It is amazing sometimes you walk in and there are three ladders because they are putting lights up. Which building are you in? It is 4238 SW Research Way. We are next to Special Occasions. Printing and Mailing is three or four days west of us. It is nice inside and the furniture is new which is such a treat since all we got in the old buildings was used furniture. Everyone has a smaller footprint but lots of light everywhere.

- Any items to add to the agenda for December? Response: Any thoughts about topics through the year that you would like to be involved in. Think about that. If there are other topics like you brought up about the Community Hall slope study update and the Transportation Plan update, let us know. We will strategically
put them in so we are balancing the meeting as best as possible while making them timely so we are hitting them up before they become critical.

- Reminder: Next meeting scheduled for December 5 from 2:00-4:00pm

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn meeting made by Kate Hunter-Zaworski.
Seconded
Motion passed.

- Meeting adjourned.