



South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

Layton McCurdy, M.D., Chairman
Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Vice Chair
Doug R. Forbes, D.M.D.
Mr. Kenneth W. Jackson
Dr. Raghu Korrapati
Dr. Louis B. Lynn
Ms. Cynthia C. Mosteller
Mr. James Sanders
Mr. Y. W. Scarborough, III
Mr. Charles L. Talbert, III
Mr. Hood Temple
Mr. Randy Thomas
Mr. Neal J. Workman, Jr.
Dr. Mitchell Zais

Dr. Garrison Walters, Executive Director

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 14, 2008
TO: Members, Facilities Advisory Committee
FROM: Mr. Gary S. Glenn, Director of Finance, Facilities, & MIS
SUBJECT: Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting

The Facilities Advisory Committee will meet on Tuesday, October 21, 2008 at 10:30 a.m. in the First Floor Conference Room. The agenda and meeting materials are attached.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (803) 737-2155.

Enclosures

AGENDA

FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 21, 2008
10:30 A.M.
FIRST FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
1333 MAIN STREET, SUITE 200
COLUMBIA, SC 29201

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Minutes from February 12, 2008
3. Alternative Construction Delivery
 - a. Ginger Hudock on using Design Build Process at USC Aiken
4. Capital Project Approval for Technical Colleges
 - a. State Tech Board Approval
5. Comprehensive Permanent Improvement Project (CPIP) Scoring
 - a. Scoring of construction projects in CPIP Year 2 that are not on the Master Plan.
 - b. Using the terms “renovation” and “maintenance” interchangeably in describing projects.
 - When does a project stop being a “maintenance needs” project and become a “renovation” project?
 - c. Appropriate “documentation” for CPIP projects.
 - d. CPIP Economic Development Portion 4a-c.
6. Managing Maintenance Needs
 - a. How do we keep up with maintenance needs?
 - Projects under \$500,000 CHE will never see.
 - b. How often should we repeat the survey?
 - Currently scheduled for January 2010.
7. Discussion of Bond Bill Proposal
8. Capital Project Regulatory Relief Initiative
9. Other Business
 - a. Next Meeting – February 2009 (Day TBD)

MINUTES

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 12, 2008
10:30 A.M.
CHE CONFERENCE ROOM

Committee Members Present

Mr. Gary Glenn, *Chair*
Mr. Bob Wells, *Clemson*
Mr. John Malmrose, *MUSC*
Mr. Jim FitzGerald, *The Citadel*
Ms. Sandy Williams, *Coastal Carolina*
Mr. Ralph Davis, *Francis Marion*
Mr. Jeff Beaver, *Lander*
Mr. Tony Ateca, *USC Aiken*
Mr. Rick Puncke, *USC Upstate*
Mr. Walter Hardin, *Winthrop*
Ms. Judy Hrinda, *SC Technical College*
Office System
Mr. Dennis Rogers, *Aiken TC*
Mr. Tuck Hanna, *Greenville TC*
Mr. Mike Parrott, *USC Beaufort*
Mr. Bruce Blumberg, *USC Sumter*

Mr. Walter Hardin, *Winthrop*
Mr. Dale Wilson, *Piedmont TC*

Committee Members Absent

Mr. Charles Jeffcoat, *USC Columbia*
Ms. Monica Scott, *College of Charleston*
Ms. Betty Jenkins, *SC State University*
Mr. Mike Parrott, *USC Beaufort*
Mr. Bruce Blumberg, *USC Sumter*

Guests

Ms. Donna Collins

CHE Staff

Ms. Camille Brown
Ms. Alyson Goff

For the record, notification of the meeting was made to the public as required by the Freedom of Information Act.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Glenn at 10:30 a.m. He welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked the attendees to introduce themselves.

I. Approval of Minutes from October 24, 2007 Meeting

Since there were no additions or corrections to the Minutes of the meeting on February 13, it was moved (Rogers), seconded (Puncke), and voted to approve the Minutes as written.

II. Recommendations of Workgroups for Follow-up Actions

Mr. Glenn asked each workgroup leader to discuss the recommendations.

A.) Develop Parameters for Reporting Infrastructure Needs

Mr. Wells provided an overview of the group's recommendations which were provided in the meeting materials. He stated that it might be best to view the infrastructure in relation to the percentage of education and general (E&G) space an institution had. Later in the discussion, it was decided that either a percentage of E&G space or the infrastructure the institution is responsible would be included.

Mr. Puncke asked if the list provided was intended to be exhaustive or if institutions could add as necessary. The Committee agreed that the list should be flexible as to allow each institution to adjust according to its particular needs.

Mr. Beaver asked if parking lots were to be included. Mr. Wells responded that for his institution, parking lots were auxiliaries. He stated that if the institution did not charge for the space, then it would be considered E&G. Mr. Glenn noted that most technical colleges do not charge for parking, therefore, it would normally be included in their infrastructure listing.

Mr. Wilson asked what the purpose of the information was. Mr. Malmrose answered that it would help document the needs of the institutions and would support presentations with various stakeholders.

B.) Best Practices for Future Building Condition Surveys

Mr. Hardin provided an overview of the group's recommendations which were provided in the meeting materials. It was clarified that the condition of the building should be assessed based on the current configuration of the facility. Mr. Davis stated his group (reporting deferred maintenance reductions) was concerned about addressing facilities that are LEED certified. Through conversation, the Committee decided the issue was more standard related than condition related. Mr. Glenn recommended that the first page of the survey be revised to include a box to indicate if the facility was LEED or Green Globe certified.

Ms. Goff stated the surveys would not be completed again until January 2010 but thought it might be beneficial for a few institutions to do a sample survey to see if the survey worked as anticipated. Mr. Malmrose volunteered to do so.

C.) Reporting Maintenance Needs Reductions

Mr. Davis provided an overview of the group's recommendations which were provided in the meeting materials. It was clarified a draft survey would be included in the initial request for project approval to help identify the portion of maintenance needs being reduced as a result of the project. It was noted that factors not considered in the calculation of the condition would still be an important aspect when requesting project approval. When a project is closed, it was recommended the institution revise the survey as part of the closeout process. It clarified the revised condition should be reported in the next data submission to the CHE Management Information System (CHEMIS).

D.) Review Application of Criteria for Scoring and Prioritizing Capital Improvement Bond (CIB) Requests (Standards 1 and 2)

Mr. Rogers provided an overview of the group's recommendations which were provided in the meeting materials. Members were informed that the revised criteria would be used for the upcoming scoring and prioritizing of Year 2 requests in the 2008 CPIP. The deadline for additional information was March 28. There was some discussion of the effect of the redistribution of points and the potential decrease in some scores. It was noted that staff was not expecting a significant difference but would monitor the results.

Mr. Glenn stated staff would provide a summary of the agreements pertaining to each group's recommendations and e-mail the members to ensure accuracy of the meeting's discussions.

III. Other Business

Members were reminded of the upcoming visits to discuss the Comprehensive Permanent Improvement Plan (CPIP) and asked members to confirm the scheduled dates. Also, Ms. Goff asked the members to correct their fall facilities data discrepancies. She noted the data had numerous uses which were being delayed until all institutions verified their data.

The next meeting of the Facilities Advisory Committee was scheduled for October 14, 2008, at 10:30 a.m.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alyson M. Goff
Recorder

**Attachments are not included in this mailing but will be filed with the permanent record of these minutes and are available for review upon request.*

CAPITAL PERMANENT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT SCORING

On September 16, 2008 Mr. Dennis Rogers, Mr. Gary Glenn, & Ms. Courtney Blake held a teleconference to review the criteria used to score and prioritize CIB requests in Year Two of the Comprehensive Permanent Improvement Plan (CPIP). The complete criteria document is included. For simplicity, the proposed changes are noted in red:

**SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
CAPITAL FUNDING GOALS FOR
PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS**

The following goals have been formulated to guide the Commission on Higher Education in making capital funding recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly.

STATEWIDE GOALS

- To ensure campus health and safety by supporting projects designed to remedy existing issues that adversely affect human well being
- To address critical maintenance needs of the institutions, thereby protecting the State’s capital investment in higher education
- To alleviate problems resulting from critical enrollment and/or programmatic growth, including needs for state-of-the-art academic space
- To support needs that are significant to continuing economic development in the state or service area

Points will be assigned to Related Standards, Rating Criteria, and Other Considerations. A maximum of 80 points may be generated through Related Standards and a maximum of 120 points may be generated through Rating Criteria. Projects will be rated according to the total combined number of points generated up to a maximum of 200 points. An additional 5 points may be generated based on Other Considerations.

.....
(REVISED SEPTEMBER 2008)

SECTION I – RELATED STANDARDS

Each proposed project will be reviewed and rated for consistency and compatibility with the following related standards:

- ❖ **STANDARD 1. The proposed project is consistent with the institutions master plan and is critical and central to the institution’s approved mission. (If project does not meet these criteria, request will not be scored, prioritized, or recommended for state bond funding.)**

➤ **EVALUATION**

- a. Evaluated against approved mission statement augmented by institution data which can include the project’s consistency with the institution’s Master Plan and Strategic Plan.

- ❖ **STANDARD 2. The degree to which the proposed project’s ultimate outputs (e.g., degrees awarded by discipline, number of graduates, type and volume of research, etc.) are adding critical capacity and functionality to address defined state needs. (up to 24 points)**

➤ **EVALUATION**

- a. Academic space per FTE and/or Sq Ft of research space per research \$ expended, augmented by institutional data if available.
 - i. **Equal to or under standard = 24**
 - ii. Over standard plus confirming documentation = 20
 - iii. Maintenance Needs, multiple buildings = 12
 - iv. Over standard but no documentation or documentation N/A = 0

❖ **STANDARD 3. The degree to which the need for the quantity and type of space can be defended through the application of objective space analysis, including space guidelines and appropriateness of offerings. (up to 20 points)**

1. **EVALUATION**

- a. Measured against fall 2007 space factor for classroom utilization, augmented by institutional data if available (studies showing that additional space or different space is needed)
 - i. **Under standard = 20**
 - ii. **For library projects only, external documentation of library deficiencies = 20**
 - iii. Over standard plus confirming documentation = 16
 - iv. Maintenance Needs, multiple buildings = 10
 - v. Over standard but no documentation or documentation N/A = 0

❖ **STANDARD 4. The degree of non-capital improvement bond funding beyond the required local support included in the project. (up to 20 points)**

1. **EVALUATION**

- a. Information from CPIP, augmented by data provided by institution if available
 - i. **Documented external funding of 20% or more of total project = 20**
 - ii. **Documented external funding <20% of total project = 15**
 - iii. **Documented external funding < or = 15% of total project = 10**
 - iv. **Documented external funding < or = 10% of total project = 5**
 - v. **Documented external funding < 5% of total project = 0 pts.**

❖ **STANDARD 5. Documented Operational Savings or Documented Reduction in Maintenance Needs (up to 10 points)**

1. **EVALUATION**

- a. Verification that project has **operational savings, or reduction in maintenance needs**
 - i. Both verifications = 10
 - ii. One of the above = 7

❖ **STANDARD 6. Documentation that all alternatives have been explored and that the proposed remedy is the best option available. (up to 6 points)**

1. **EVALUATION**

- a. Documentation included in CPIP – 6

Maximum Points for Related Standards = 80

.....

SECTION II – RATING CRITERIA

1) HEALTH & SAFETY (up to 30 points)

a. The degree to which an existing condition can be documented to be unsafe and unhealthy for human well being. (up to 15 points)

➤ **EVALUATION**

- ❖ Verified by external study or institutional evaluation:
 - i. Citations for air quality, code issues, or life safety issues = 15
 - ii. Air quality or other code issues (external study) = 10
 - iii. Air quality or other code issues (institutional justification) = 5

b. The appropriateness of the proposed solution to the defined health or safety issue.

➤ **EVALUATION**

- ❖ Institutional documentation or in CPIP = 7.5

c. The degree that the institution's and the State's well being would be adversely impacted through discontinuance of activities if the defined health and safety issues are not addressed.

➤ **EVALUATION**

- ❖ Information from CPIP, studies on file at CHE, and institutional documentation if provided
 - i. Institutional verification that activities could not be conducted in alternate facilities so as to require discontinuance/or maintenance needs = 7.5

2) MAINTENANCE NEEDS (up to 30 points)

a. The degree to which the proposed project addresses maintenance needs as reported in the institution's CHEMIS submission using a rolling average over the most recent three-year period.

➤ **EVALUATION**

- ❖ Information will be obtained from Building Data Summary, generated by CHEMIS. Points assigned based on range of building condition codes (below):

| <u>Building Condition Code</u> | <u>Points Assigned</u> |
|--|------------------------|
| New Construction or N/A | 0 |
| 90-100 | 0 |
| 80-89 | 7.5 |
| 70-79 | 12.5 |
| 0-69 | 15 |
| Infrastructure/MN (multiple buildings) | 15 |

b. The degree to which the institution's expenditures for building maintenance compare with the amount generated for building maintenance¹ in the MRR (according to the percent funded to the institution) using a rolling average for the most recent three-year period.

➤ **EVALUATION**

- ❖ Institutions report amount expended for routine maintenance (from any source) for E&G Buildings. Data will be compared with the amounts

generated by MRR (at the percent funded to the institution) and averaged for the most recent three-year period.

- i. Expenditure for E&G maintenance equal to or greater than MRR estimates = 15
- ii. Expenditure not reported but data for estimate available to CHE = 15
- iii. Expenditure less than MRR estimate or not reported and estimate not available = 0

3) ENROLLMENT & PROGRAMMATIC GROWTH (up to 30 points)

a. The degree to which a space shortage can be objectively supported through space analysis – both on an institutional macro level as well as the micro level of a particular program.

➤ **EVALUATION**

❖ Data to be supplied by institution

- i. External confirming documentation/data = 15
- ii. Internal confirming documentation/data = 12.5
- iii. Maintenance Needs = 7.5
- iv. None Reported or N/A = 0

b. The degree to which the need for the outputs of the additional proposed space cannot be met through alternative delivery systems (e.g., distance learning technologies, etc.).

➤ **EVALUATION**

❖ Data to be supplied by institution, if applicable.

- i. If none can be met based on program of study or maintenance needs = 15
- ii. If all dedicated to distance learning = 15
- iii. If can be partially met = 11
- iv. No documentation or N/A = 0

4) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (up to 30 points)

a. The proposed project is consistent with the State's and/or service area's priorities for continuing economic development as supported by appropriate economic development entities (e.g., State, Local, or Regional Departments of Commerce).

➤ **EVALUATION**

❖ Documented evidence – 10

b. The proposed project is a critical component of an articulated State, regional, or community comprehensive economic development plan.

➤ **EVALUATION**

❖ Documented evidence – 10

c. Funding critical to the overall success of the economic development initiative was provided by external parties (e.g. Local funding).

➤ **EVALUATION**

❖ Documented evidence of funding amounts – 10

Maximum Points for Rating Criteria = 120

.....

SECTION III – OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

1. Previously Approved Capital Improvement Bonds (CIBs) & State Funding

Projects that have previously received CIBs and/or State funding (documentation to be provided by the institution) will be scored in the following manner:

- If percentage of previous amount funded is greater than 25% of the current **project** = 4 points
- If percentage of previous amount funded is less than 25% of the current **project** = 2 points

2. Longevity of Request for CIB Funding

- If institution has previously requested state bond funding (in year two of the CPIP) for this project **continuously** for five or more years = 1 point
(Institutions must provide appropriate documentation.)

3. Essential Sequencing of Multiple Projects

Projects that require a phasing sequence with other projects in the ranking list will be listed in the order required. An example of a phasing requirement would be a utility plant expansion request that would need to be completed before a new building request could come online due to insufficient existing utilities capacities. If the rankings established by the process outlined in this document do not place projects in the appropriate phasing sequence, then the project rankings will be revised accordingly. This would be accomplished by ranking all other projects involved in the phasing sequence behind the initial project. If the second project has a higher percentage point total, then it will be moved to immediately after the first project. The rationale would continue for the third and subsequent projects as necessary. *(This may be used for projects that have received partial funding and for which the institution can document a continuing critical need and/or to differentiate between projects that have the same scores.)*

Maximum Points for Other Considerations = 5 points

.....

Building Maintenance is defined as the cost (including salaries, wages, supplies, materials, equipment, services, and other expenses) necessary to keep a building in good appearance and usable condition and prevent the building from deterioration once it has been placed in first class condition for that type and age of building. It does not include auxiliary enterprise buildings. Building maintenance includes minor repairs and alterations, costs of materials, hire of personnel, and other necessary expenses for the repair and/or painting of the following: roofs, exterior walls, foundations, flooring, ceilings, partitions, doors, windows, plaster, structural ironworks, screens, windows shades, blinds, plumbing, heating and air conditioning equipment within or a part of the building, electric wiring, light fixtures (including the replacement of lamps), washing of all outside window surfaces, built-in shelving, and other related items.

MANAGING MAINTENANCE NEEDS

Institution Name: MUSC
Building Number: 820
Building Name: Bank Building
Location: _____
Gross Square Feet: 36,649
Year Const / Renov: 1972 _____
Replacement Cost: \$6,419,000

Respondent: _____
Name
Telephone: _____
E-Mail: _____

REMINDER: The revised condition must be reported in the next CHEMIS facilities reporting cycle.

Comments:

Please rate the building adequacy on the following categories using the same 1-5 scale.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|----|---|--|------------------|--|----------------|--|--------------------|
| <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 50%;">Flexible Design</td><td style="width: 5%;"><input type="checkbox"/></td><td style="width: 45%;"></td></tr> <tr><td>Suitable for Present Use</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Gross-to-Assignable Area</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Heating Efficiency</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Cooling Efficiency</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-left: 20px;">Lighting Efficiency</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Average Energy Efficiency</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td>##</td></tr> </table> | Flexible Design | <input type="checkbox"/> | | Suitable for Present Use | <input type="checkbox"/> | | Gross-to-Assignable Area | <input type="checkbox"/> | | Heating Efficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> | | Cooling Efficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> | | Lighting Efficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> | | Average Energy Efficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> | ## | <p>LEED / Green Globe Certified</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 20px; height: 15px; border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0e0e0;"></td><td>Certified Silver</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 20px; height: 15px; border: 1px solid black; background-color: #d0d0d0;"></td><td>Certified Gold</td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 20px; height: 15px; border: 1px solid black; background-color: #c0c0c0;"></td><td>Certified Platinum</td></tr> </table> | | Certified Silver | | Certified Gold | | Certified Platinum |
| Flexible Design | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Suitable for Present Use | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gross-to-Assignable Area | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Heating Efficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cooling Efficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lighting Efficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Average Energy Efficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> | ## | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Certified Silver | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Certified Gold | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Certified Platinum | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Please include additional information about the building, if applicable.

Please do not enter data in the cells below this line. Begin data entry on Page 2.

| | System Avg. Score | Multiplier | | System % of Building | | Current % Value Bldg. |
|-----------------------|-------------------|------------|---|----------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Foundation | 1.750 | 0.850 | x | 0.13 | = | 0.1105 |
| Exterior Walls | 5.000 | 0.000 | x | 0.13 | = | 0.0000 |
| Floor | 1.667 | 0.867 | x | 0.07 | = | 0.0607 |
| Roof | 2.333 | 0.700 | x | 0.07 | = | 0.0490 |
| Interior Walls | 4.000 | 0.200 | x | 0.03 | = | 0.0060 |
| Windows | 4.000 | 0.200 | x | 0.02 | = | 0.0040 |
| Doors | 2.600 | 0.620 | x | 0.01 | = | 0.0062 |
| Ceiling | 3.500 | 0.350 | x | 0.03 | = | 0.0105 |
| Heating | 4.000 | 0.200 | x | 0.10 | = | 0.0200 |
| Cooling | 4.000 | 0.200 | x | 0.10 | = | 0.0200 |
| Plumbing | 2.556 | 0.633 | x | 0.08 | = | 0.0507 |
| Electrical | 2.375 | 0.688 | x | 0.08 | = | 0.0550 |
| Elevators | 3.667 | 0.300 | x | 0.01 | = | 0.0030 |
| Safety | 1.667 | 0.867 | x | 0.05 | = | 0.0433 |
| Design Standards | 4.333 | 0.133 | x | 0.09 | = | 0.0120 |
| Agency Rating: | | | | 1.00 | | 0.451 |

| | Bldg. Avg. Grade | Condition Code | Condition Multiplier | Difference |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|------------|
| Replacement Cost: | \$6,419,000 | 1 | Satisfactory | 1.00 |
| Building Condition: | 45 | 2 | Remodel A | 0.8 |
| | | 3 | Remodel B | 0.5 |
| Maintenance Need: | \$3,530,450 | 4 | Remodel C | 0.2 |
| | | 5 | Replace | 0.00 |

Building Name: Bank Building

Building Number: 820

| Foundation 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|---------------------------------|-------------|--------|
| Cracked Walls | 2 | |
| Foundation Settlement | 2 | |
| Foundation Deterioration | 2 | |
| Design Load | 1 | |
| Average | 1.75 | |

| Exterior Wall System 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|---|----------|--------|
| Physical Condition | 5 | |
| Waterproofing | 5 | |
| Caulking | 5 | |
| Pointing | 5 | |
| Code Compliance | 5 | |
| Insulation | 5 | |
| Maintainability | 5 | |
| Painting | 5 | |
| Average | 5 | |

| Floor System 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------|
| Structural Condition | 2 | |
| Maintainability | 2 | |
| Floor Finish | 2 | |
| Vibration | 2 | |
| Fire Rating | 1 | |
| Design Load | 1 | |
| Average | 1.6667 | |

| Roof System 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|----------------------------------|---------------|--------|
| Physical Condition | 3 | |
| Leaks | 3 | |
| Drainage | 3 | |
| Insulation | 3 | |
| Fire Rating | 1 | |
| Design Load | 1 | |
| Average | 2.3333 | |
| Age of Roof Cover: | | |
| Type of Roof Cover: | | |
| Flat: | | |
| Pitched: | | |

| Interior Wall System 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|---|----------|--------|
| Physical Condition | 4 | |
| Strength & Stability | 4 | |
| Acoustical Quality | 4 | |
| Appearance | 4 | |
| Adaptability | 4 | |
| Maintainability | 4 | |
| Average | 4 | |

| Window System 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|------------------------------------|----------|--------|
| Physical Condition | 4 | |
| Appearance | 4 | |
| Functional Ability | 4 | |
| Infiltration | 4 | |
| Maintainability | 4 | |
| Average | 4 | |

| Door System 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|----------------------------------|------------|--------|
| Door Leaf | 3 | |
| Frame | 3 | |
| Hardware | 3 | |
| Security | 3 | |
| Fire Rating | 1 | |
| Average | 2.6 | |

| Ceiling System 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|-------------------------------------|------------|--------|
| Structural Condition | 2 | |
| Accoustical | 4 | |
| Accessibility | 4 | |
| Appearance | 4 | |
| Average | 3.5 | |

| Heating System 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------|
| Heating Capacity | 4 | |
| Temperature Control | 4 | |
| Noise Level | 4 | |
| Air Circulation & Vent | 4 | |
| Reliability | 4 | |
| Reasonable Energy Consumption | 4 | |
| Filtration | 4 | |
| Humidity | 4 | |
| Average | 4 | |
| Age of System: | | |
| Heating Capacity-BTUs: | | |

| Cooling System 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------|
| Cooling Capacity | 4 | |
| Reasonable Energy Consumption | 4 | |
| Temperature | 4 | |
| Noise Level | 4 | |
| Air Circulation & Vent | 4 | |
| Reliability | 4 | |
| Filtration | 4 | |
| Humidity | 4 | |
| Average | 4 | |
| Age of System: | | |
| Cooling Capacity-Tons: | | |

| Plumbing System 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|--------|
| Water Pressure & Supply Quantities | 1 | |
| Sanitation Hazards or Cross Functions | 1 | |
| Drain & Waste Function | 3 | |
| Fixture Quantities | 3 | |
| Fixture Types & Cond. | 3 | |
| Wheel Chair Fixtures | 3 | |
| Restroom Facilities | 3 | |
| Roof Drainage | 3 | |
| Site Drainage | 3 | |
| Average | 2.5556 | |

| Electrical System 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|--|--------------|--------|
| Safety Conditions | 3 | |
| Service Capacity | 2 | |
| Panel Capacity | 2 | |
| Convenience Outlets | 2 | |
| Light Levels | 3 | |
| Fixtures | 3 | |
| Emergency Power | 3 | |
| Exit Lighting | 1 | |
| Average | 2.375 | |

| Elevator System 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|--------|
| Size & Number | 1 | |
| Maintainability | 5 | |
| Code Compliance | 5 | |
| Average | 3.6667 | |

| Safety Standards 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|--------|
| Means of Egress | 1 | |
| Fire Ratings | 1 | |
| Extinguishing Systems | 1 | |
| Detection & Alarm Sys. | 1 | |
| Lighting Systems | 1 | |
| Handicap Access | 5 | |
| Average | 1.6667 | |

| Design Standards 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 | | Rating |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|--------|
| Flexible Design | 5 | |
| Suitable for Present Use | 5 | |
| Gross to Assignable Area | 3 | |
| Average | 4.3333 | |

Calculation for E&G Deferred Maintenance Plans

Source: Building Condition Survey - 2007 Update & 2007 Annual Property Improvement Report

E&G Facilities

| | <u>CHEMIS RCB</u> | <u>CHEMIS Bldg. Condition Code^{1,2}</u> | <u>Amount to Bring to Like-New Condition</u> | <u>Annual Investment Required to Maintain (APPA Avg. 3%)</u> | <u>Acceptable Amount of Deferred Maintenance (APPA Std.)</u> | <u>Magnitude of Deferred Maintenance (Assume 33 yrs.)³</u> | <u>Deferred Maintenance to Eliminate</u> | <u>Additional Funding Per Year to Eliminate in # of Yrs.</u> | <u>Total Need Per Yr. to Maintain & Eliminate Deferred Maintenance</u> |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| MUSC | | | | RCB * (APPA Avg) | 10% of RCB - Col. 4 | Col. 3 - (Col 1 * 3%) | Col. 6 - Col. 5 | 20 (+Col. 7 /# Yrs) | (Col. 4 + Col 8) |
| | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] | [6] | [7] | [8] | [9] |
| 139 ASHLEY AVENUE | \$236,286 | 55 | \$106,329 | \$7,089 | \$16,540 | \$99,240 | \$82,700 | \$4,135 | \$11,224 |
| 159 1/2 RUTLEDGE AVENUE | \$148,000 | 44 | \$82,880 | \$4,440 | \$10,360 | \$78,440 | \$68,080 | \$3,404 | \$7,844 |
| 161 RUTLEDGE AVENUE | \$413,088 | 23 | \$318,078 | \$12,393 | \$28,916 | \$305,685 | \$276,769 | \$13,838 | \$26,231 |
| 168 ASHLEY AVENUE | \$318,008 | 47 | \$168,544 | \$9,540 | \$22,261 | \$159,004 | \$136,743 | \$6,837 | \$16,377 |
| 17 EHRHARDT STREET | \$894,400 | 86 | \$125,216 | \$26,832 | \$62,608 | \$98,384 | \$35,776 | \$1,789 | \$28,621 |
| 176 ASHLEY AVENUE GUEST HOUSE | \$332,800 | 93 | \$23,296 | \$9,984 | \$23,296 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$9,984 |
| 20 EHRHARDT STREET | \$826,176 | 84 | \$132,188 | \$24,785 | \$57,832 | \$107,403 | \$49,571 | \$2,479 | \$27,264 |
| 21 1/2 EHRHARDT STREET | \$30,624 | 95 | \$1,531 | \$919 | \$2,144 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$919 |
| 21 EHRHARDT STREET | \$360,501 | 77 | \$82,915 | \$10,815 | \$25,235 | \$72,100 | \$46,865 | \$2,343 | \$13,158 |
| 23 EHRHARDT STREET | \$360,501 | 74 | \$93,730 | \$10,815 | \$25,235 | \$82,915 | \$57,680 | \$2,884 | \$13,699 |
| 25 EHRHARDT STREET | \$248,282 | 75 | \$62,071 | \$7,448 | \$17,380 | \$54,622 | \$37,242 | \$1,862 | \$9,311 |
| 272 CALHOUN STREET | \$142,403 | 36 | \$91,138 | \$4,272 | \$9,968 | \$86,866 | \$76,898 | \$3,845 | \$8,117 |
| 276 A & B CALHOUN STREET | \$346,167 | 28 | \$249,240 | \$10,385 | \$24,232 | \$238,855 | \$214,624 | \$10,731 | \$21,116 |
| 28 EHRHARDT STREET | \$207,168 | 91 | \$18,645 | \$6,215 | \$14,502 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,215 |
| 3 DOUGHTY STREET | \$231,920 | 50 | \$115,960 | \$6,958 | \$16,234 | \$109,002 | \$92,768 | \$4,638 | \$11,596 |
| 30 BEE STREET | \$4,110,000 | 87 | \$534,300 | \$123,300 | \$287,700 | \$411,000 | \$123,300 | \$6,165 | \$129,465 |
| 4295 ARCO LANE WAREHOUSE | \$3,493,360 | 95 | \$174,668 | \$104,801 | \$244,535 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$104,801 |
| 45 BEE STREET | \$344,864 | 90 | \$34,486 | \$10,346 | \$24,140 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,346 |
| 49 BEE STREET | \$189,375 | 86 | \$26,513 | \$5,681 | \$13,256 | \$20,831 | \$7,575 | \$379 | \$6,060 |
| 5 DOUGHTY STREET | \$424,741 | 52 | \$203,876 | \$12,742 | \$29,732 | \$191,133 | \$161,402 | \$8,070 | \$20,812 |
| 56 COURTENAY DRIVE | \$738,400 | 97 | \$22,152 | \$22,152 | \$51,688 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$22,152 |
| 57 BEE STREET | \$275,184 | 90 | \$27,518 | \$8,256 | \$19,263 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,256 |
| 59 BEE STREET | \$249,288 | 88 | \$29,915 | \$7,479 | \$17,450 | \$22,436 | \$4,986 | \$249 | \$7,728 |
| ALUMNI MEMORIAL HOUSE | \$11,102,882 | 86 | \$1,554,403 | \$333,086 | \$777,202 | \$1,221,317 | \$444,115 | \$22,206 | \$355,292 |
| Bank Building | \$6,419,000 | 45 | \$3,530,450 | \$192,570 | \$449,330 | \$3,337,880 | \$2,888,550 | \$144,428 | \$336,998 |
| BARUCH AUDITORIUM | \$1,563,579 | 49 | \$797,425 | \$46,907 | \$109,451 | \$750,518 | \$641,067 | \$32,053 | \$78,961 |
| BASIC SCIENCE BUILDING | \$86,117,045 | 81 | \$16,362,239 | \$2,583,511 | \$6,028,193 | \$13,778,727 | \$7,750,534 | \$387,527 | \$2,971,038 |
| BSB MECHANICAL EXPANSION BLDG | \$10,000,000 | 98 | \$200,000 | \$300,000 | \$700,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$300,000 |
| CHILDREN S RESEARCH INSTITUTE | \$40,500,000 | 97 | \$1,215,000 | \$1,215,000 | \$2,835,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,215,000 |
| CLINICAL SCIENCES BUILDING | \$99,890,326 | 62 | \$37,958,324 | \$2,996,710 | \$6,992,323 | \$34,961,614 | \$27,969,291 | \$1,398,465 | \$4,395,174 |
| COLCOCK HALL | \$2,024,599 | 100 | \$0 | \$60,738 | \$141,722 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$60,738 |
| COLL OF HLTH PROF BLDG "C" | \$6,616,975 | 93 | \$463,188 | \$198,509 | \$463,188 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$198,509 |
| COLL OF HLTH PROF COMPLEX "A" | \$8,500,000 | 99 | \$85,000 | \$255,000 | \$595,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$255,000 |

Permanent Improvement and Lease Requests of Technical Colleges

Notwithstanding any review that may be required by the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education (SBTCE), the CHE review and approval is mandatory for the following unless otherwise exempted elsewhere in this document:

1. Any leases of land, buildings, or other structures including subsequent amendments and/or renewals;
2. Any acquisition of land, buildings, or other structures;
3. The construction of additional facilities or additional square footage to an existing facility including any subsequent project changes;
4. Any renovation project designed to accomplish space reconfiguration and/or space use change; and
5. Any separate architectural and engineering or design work that could eventually require Commission review as a permanent improvement.

The SBTCE and the technical colleges are eligible to receive state funds for capital facilities. Section 59-53-57 of the South Carolina Code of Laws requires the SBTCE to obtain and transmit to the State Treasurer a certificate from the appropriate official at the technical colleges stating that a minimum of 20 percent of each project cost has been provided by the local support area. Amounts above the required 20 percent are subject to the CHE's approval process. The provisions of this paragraph do not apply to Denmark Technical College and Technical College of the Lowcountry. Section 59-101-370 exempts deferred maintenance and renovation projects from the 20 percent requirement at these institutions.

The CHE staff will not review nor submit to the appropriate standing committee or the Commission for review any permanent improvement project or lease request that has not been reviewed and approved by the SBTCE.

FY 2009-10 Capital Budget Proposal

Tenets:

- The CPIP should remain the centerpiece for requesting Capital Improvement Bonds
- The absence of a bond bill has impacted ALL institutions and any plan adopted should include an allocation to ALL institutions
- Capital funding should be on-going and operating and capital support should be routine and predictable.

Target: \$300,000,000 (Actual Total = \$298,892,437)

.....

The proposal for the FY 2009-10 capital budget request is an accumulation of best practices from neighboring states. Drawn primarily from successful capital plans in Kentucky, Georgia, and North Carolina, the capital proposal for South Carolina consists of three parts: 1) addressing education and general (E&G) maintenance needs, 2) recognizing the phased approval process, and 3) funding construction of state priorities.

Part 1 – Addressing Educational & General (E&G) Maintenance Needs

E&G maintenance needs have grown to extraordinary levels. Colleges & universities have attempted to address these needs without the support of appropriated funding or additional increases in tuition & fees, which are restricted by political and market forces. As a part of the budget proposal for the 2008-10 biennium, the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education recommended funding maintenance needs based on an institution's E&G square footage (SF) to total system E&G SF. The proposal for South Carolina factors in an additional variable – the age of the E&G space – as the age of many of our buildings materially affects the challenges and subsequent resource allocations our institutions must consider in addressing this ongoing need. The proposal provides **\$69,423,302** or **10%** of the total maintenance needs of those colleges and universities for which the state has responsibility for maintenance as determined by the fall 2007 E&G building assessments.

- Calculation of Part 1 Funding – Funding will be allocated based on institutional E&G sq/ft to total E&G sq/ft weighted to consider the age of the building that includes the E&G space (based upon the year of construction). (See Table 1)

Part 2 – The Phased Approval Process

Higher Education acknowledges the importance of determining accurate and reliable programmatic needs and total project costs. Georgia and North Carolina both provide planning/design funding as part of their biennium capital budgets. Our plan acknowledges the current limitations on pre-design funding and allocates **\$6,356,054** (1.5% of anticipated total cost) to assist institutions in meeting this requirement. Once A&E (pre-design) work is completed, institutions will be able to refine their requests for CIB funding in the FY 2010 CPIP and provide calculated rather than estimated requests.

- Calculation of Part 2 Funding – Funding will be based on 1.5% of the estimated total construction cost of projects included in CPIP Year 2 that scored 70% of the total points available (205 total points x 70% ≈ 143.0) or was an institutional 1st priority. (Excludes projects funded in Part 1 and Part 3 and qualifying projects with previous funding equal to or greater than the pre-design allocation.) (See Table 2)

Part 3 – Construction Funding

Construction funding is the final step by which capital planning is successfully implemented. In general, most states finance major capital projects through the issuance of bonds. Georgia, for example, issues bonds every other year as a part of its biennial budget cycle. Our plan includes **\$223,113,081** to fund projects deemed most important to the state as determined by the CPIP Year 2 scoring process. Institutions will be limited to funding for their highest qualifying project in each year for which capital bonds are appropriated.

- Calculation of Part 3 Funding – Using a target of \$300,000,000 for the total CIB request, the residual funding after maintenance and pre-design allocations will allow the state to fully fund state priorities based upon scoring of CPIP Year 2 project requests. (See Table 3)

Summary of Capital Plan Allocations

The total request for CIB Funding for FY 2009-10 totals **\$ 298,892,437** including **\$69,423,302** directed to reducing the significant backlog of maintenance needs, **\$6,356,054** to fund the pre-design phase for projects that did not receive construction funding but which scored greater than 142.5 points on the CPIP Year 2 prioritization or were an institutional 1st priority, and **\$223,113,081** to fund state priorities with the caveat that only one construction project would be funded at each institution each year. Table 4 shows the proposed allocation for each of South Carolina's public colleges and universities and Tables 5A & 5B show the entire CPIP Year 2 request.

Table 1 - Addressing Maintenance Needs

| Maintenance Needs Allocation | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | Funding Target: | | \$69,423,302 | | | |
| Institution | Fall 2007 E&G SF % ¹ | Weighted E&G SF | % of Total | % of Weighted Total | Allocation | Total MN per Fall 2007 Report | With Allocation of Residual | Allocation % of Report Value |
| Clemson | 2,221,008 | 3,168,909 | 17.46% | 18.33% | \$12,725,459 | \$107,114,730 | \$13,097,410 | 11.88% |
| USC Columbia (incl. SOM) | 3,266,852 | 4,482,012 | 25.68% | 25.93% | \$17,998,514 | \$302,254,516 | \$18,524,591 | 5.95% |
| MUSC | 1,511,308 | 1,928,378 | 11.88% | 11.15% | \$7,743,830 | \$70,247,905 | \$7,970,175 | 11.02% |
| Citadel | 500,930 | 720,799 | 3.94% | 4.17% | \$2,894,529 | \$14,450,549 | \$2,979,133 | 20.03% |
| Coastal Carolina | 471,137 | 556,546 | 3.70% | 3.22% | \$2,234,932 | \$40,264,350 | \$2,300,258 | 5.55% |
| College of Charleston | 843,910 | 1,173,505 | 6.63% | 6.79% | \$4,712,471 | \$26,664,650 | \$4,850,211 | 17.67% |
| Francis Marion | 426,622 | 549,557 | 3.35% | 3.18% | \$2,206,866 | \$6,776,729 | \$2,271,370 | 32.57% |
| Lander | 384,561 | 457,016 | 3.02% | 2.64% | \$1,835,248 | \$8,679,753 | \$1,888,891 | 21.14% |
| SC State | 635,166 | 889,805 | 4.99% | 5.15% | \$3,573,209 | \$38,274,155 | \$3,677,649 | 9.34% |
| USC Aiken | 409,592 | 472,543 | 3.22% | 2.73% | \$101,850 | \$101,850 | \$101,850 | 100.00% |
| USC Beaufort | 56,560 | 79,988 | 0.44% | 0.46% | \$321,209 | \$1,772,053 | \$330,597 | 18.13% |
| USC Upstate | 289,040 | 354,379 | 2.27% | 2.05% | \$1,423,088 | \$8,458,108 | \$1,464,683 | 16.83% |
| Winthrop | 947,657 | 1,442,877 | 7.45% | 8.35% | \$5,794,195 | \$34,834,926 | \$5,963,552 | 16.63% |
| USC Lancaster | 157,282 | 192,875 | 1.24% | 1.12% | \$774,533 | \$15,435,403 | \$797,171 | 5.02% |
| USC Salkehatchie | 126,270 | 180,571 | 0.99% | 1.04% | \$725,123 | \$7,356,003 | \$746,318 | 9.86% |
| USC Sumter | 126,034 | 171,865 | 0.99% | 0.99% | \$690,160 | \$4,528,810 | \$710,333 | 15.24% |
| USC Union | 41,018 | 71,407 | 0.32% | 0.41% | \$286,750 | \$650,910 | \$295,132 | 44.05% |
| Aiken TC | | | | | | \$5,895,591 | | |
| Central Carolina TC | | | | | | \$317,338 | | |
| Denmark TC | 145,895 | 187,121 | 1.15% | 1.08% | \$751,424 | \$5,687,031 | \$773,387 | 13.21% |
| Florence-Darlington TC | | | | | | \$27,020,791 | | |
| Greenville TC | | | | | | \$21,579,495 | | |
| Horry-Georgetown TC | | | | | | \$14,847,195 | | |
| Midlands TC | | | | | | \$4,308,441 | | |
| Northeastern TC ² | | | | | | \$0 | | |
| Orangeburg-Calhoun TC | | | | | | \$127,750 | | |
| Piedmont TC | | | | | | \$3,665,236 | | |
| Spartanburg CC | | | | | | \$6,357,288 | | |
| TC of the Lowcountry | 161,964 | 207,723 | 1.27% | 1.20% | \$680,589 | \$680,589 | \$680,589 | 100.00% |
| Tri-County TC | | | | | | \$7,859,750 | | |
| Trident TC | | | | | | \$7,219,955 | | |
| Williamsburg TC | | | | | | \$2,551,786 | | |
| York TC | | | | | | \$1,121,820 | | |
| Total | 12,722,806 | 17,287,875 | 100.00% | 100.00% | \$67,473,980 | \$797,105,455 | \$69,423,302 | 8.46% |
| Maintenance Needs - State Responsibility | | | | | | \$694,233,019 | | |
| Maintenance Needs - Non-State Responsibility | | | | | | \$102,872,436 | | |
| Total Maintenance Needs | | | | | | \$797,105,455 | | |

1 Source: CHEMIS Fall 2007 Building Data Summary. Leased facilities are not included.

2 In the 2007 maintenance needs study, the institution did not identify any buildings with needs beyond routine maintenance.

Table 2 - Recognizing the Phased Approval Process

Table 3 - Construction of State Priorities

Table 4 – FY 2009-10 CIB Allocation Summary

Table 5A – FY 2009-10 CIP Year 2 Requests
(Projects scoring greater than or equal to 143.0 Points (≈70%))

Table 5B – FY 2009-10 CIP Year 2 Requests
(Projects scoring less than 143.0 Points (≈70%))

**Commission on Higher Education Revised Recommendations
for Improving the Higher Education Facilities Approval Process**

Overall Objectives: To improve State planning, streamline the State-approval process, improve institutional planning, and establish an effective alternative delivery system.

| <u>Original Recommendation</u> | <u>Proposed Action</u> | <u>Rationale</u> |
|--|---|--|
| 1.) The State's Comprehensive Permanent Improvement Plan (CPIP) process should be made meaningful. | Carry Forward | Meetings with institutional representatives confirm the continued need for this recommendation. |
| 2.) Eliminate the project approval requirement for routine repair, maintenance, and replacement of building systems provided the Office of State Engineer and State Procurement requirements remain intact. | REVISE: Define permanent improvement projects as those with a value of greater than \$1 million. Institutions would be required to submit a quarterly report to the appropriate entities which identifies completed projects with a total cost between \$500,000 and \$1 million. | The majority of projects meeting this criterion are routine repair, replacement, and maintenance. <u>Since 2005, 223 projects were closed with budgets of \$1 million or less – 157 (70%) of which were routine maintenance.</u> |
| 3.) Adopt code changes allowing institutions to conduct feasibility/planning studies up to and including design development without requiring State-level approvals to plan. | Carry Forward | Meetings with institutional representatives confirm the continued need for this recommendation. |
| 4.) Eliminate the duplication of forms to the Office of State Budget for capital projects through both the CPIP and its "Detailed Justification for Capital Budget Priorities" portion of the annual State Budget Request. | Defer | In light of the current work of the legislatively-mandated Higher Education Study Committee, staff believes this recommendation should be put on hold until the work of this group is completed. |
| 5.) Require each higher education institution to develop and submit for CHE approval a funding plan to bring its deferred maintenance to an acceptable level. | Delete - Accomplished | The Commission adopted a policy in May 2007 to implement this recommendation. Institutions submitted their plans in August 2007, and the information was used to complete the October 2007 report, <i>An Assessment of Higher Education Facilities Conditions & Measuring Deferred Maintenance</i> . CHE staff will continue to work with institutional facilities offices to develop parameters to measure infrastructure needs. |
| <u>Original Recommendation</u> | <u>Proposed Action</u> | <u>Rationale</u> |
| 6.) The Governor, in consultation with Senate and House leadership, should appoint a Blue Ribbon Committee to study and provide recommendations to enable South Carolina to implement an effective alternative construction delivery system – such as design build, Construction Management at Risk, Construction Management/General Contracting – for State agencies. The Blue Ribbon Committee should complete its report no later than March 1, 2007. | Delete - Accomplished | During the 2007 legislative session, Senate Bill 282 was introduced to clarify the use of alternative delivery methods thereby making it easier for institutions and other state agencies to utilize methods such as design build and Construction Management at Risk. The bill's conference committee report was completed at the end of the legislative session but did not reach the chamber floors. The Senate and House are expected to consider the report in January 2008 when the General Assembly reconvenes. |
| | ADD: Provide flexibility up to 20% within permanent improvement project budgets for budget increases only prior to additional approval by the required State entities. Institutions would be required to submit a quarterly report to the appropriate entities which identifies projects in which the budgets were increased using this flexibility. | Discussions with Budget & Control Board staff and institutional staffs have illustrated the benefit of providing this flexibility. The uncontrollable and often volatile construction market has required institutions to request budget increases – many of which require review and approval of all State-approving entities. A percentage or dollar maximum increase would allow institutions to make the necessary budget changes more quickly thereby saving the state time and money. <u>Since 2004, 70 project budgets have been increased by 20 percent or less.</u> |