



Dr. Gail Morrison  
Interim Executive Director

### MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** October 17, 2006  
**TO:** Facilities Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Ms. Lynn Metcalf, Director of Finance, Facilities, & MIS  
**SUBJECT:** Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting

The Facilities Advisory Committee will meet on Tuesday, October 24, 2006 at 10:30 a.m. in the Commission's Main Conference Room. An agenda and meeting materials are attached.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (803) 737-2265.

A G E N D A  
Facilities Advisory Committee  
October 24, 2006  
10:30 a.m.  
Main Conference Room  
Commission on Higher Education  
1333 Main Street, Suite 200  
Columbia, SC 29201

1. Introduction
2. Approval of Minutes from February 14, 2006
3. Informational Summary on the CHE Recommendations to Review the Higher Education Facilities Approval Process
4. Review Capital Improvement Bond (CIB) Request Prioritization Criteria
5. Building Condition Survey – 2007 Update
6. New Approval Submission Procedure for CHE Approvals
7. Modifications to CHE Facilities Policy and Procedures Manual – Available on Website
8. Other Business
  - a. Next Meeting

MINUTES  
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION  
Facilities Advisory Committee  
February 14, 2006  
10:30 a.m.  
CHE Conference Room

**Committee Members Present**

Ms. Lynn Metcalf, *Chair, CHE*  
Mr. Tony Ateca, *USC Aiken*  
Ms. Donna Collins, *USC Columbia*  
Mr. Tuck Hanna, *Greenville TC*  
Mr. Walter Hardin, *Winthrop*  
Mr. Frank Koltonski, *Francis Marion*  
Mr. John Malmrose, *MUSC*  
Col. Don Tomasik, *The Citadel*  
Mr. Tom Suttles, *Lander*  
Dr. Richard Weldon, *Coastal Carolina*  
Mr. Bob Wells, *Clemson*  
Mr. Dale Wilson, *Piedmont TC*

**Guests**

Mr. Craig Hess  
Dr. Sally Horner  
Ms. Beth McInnis  
Ms. Jennifer Pearce  
Mr. Charles Shawver

**Staff**

Mr. Gary Glenn  
Ms. Jan Stewart

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

The meeting of the Facilities Advisory Committee was called to order by Ms. Metcalf on February 14, 2006 at 10:30 a.m. in the CHE conference room. She welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Mr. Glenn who has moved to the Finance and Facilities Division and is working with the MRR and other finance work.

**I. Approval of Minutes from June 14, 2005 Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting of the Facilities Advisory Committee on June 14, 2005 were approved as corrected.

**II. CHE Recommendation Concerning Capital Improvement Project Requests and Suggestions for Improving the Process**

Ms. Metcalf stated that as a result of some concerns, the Finance and Facilities Committee presented the following recommendation which was adopted by the Commission on February 2, 2006.

*“The Commission recommends, that in the absence of statewide policies concerning construction costs of all buildings to include LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) buildings, the Budget and Control Board, the Joint Bond Review Committee, and all other appropriate agencies study construction costs, comparative cost benefits analyses, and the life cycle costs of facilities prior to*

*approving the project. The Commission on Higher Education is concerned that the State may not be realizing the most efficient construction and operation costs for State facilities. The Commission further recommends that a review of the entire process be conducted with the goal to reduce the timeline for capital projects from conception to completion. The Commission also recommends alternative delivery methods be made available to the institutions for capital projects.”*

The recommendation arose from Committee members’ concerns that they did not know enough about some of the projects submitted to CHE for approval. They realized there are some things which are not under the Commission’s purview. However, what initiated this recommendation was a project which took four years from the time it was initially approved by CHE to approval of the increase in funds to begin construction. This recommendation was submitted to the Budget and Control Board and other appropriate agencies in attempt to compress the approval process. Mr. Malmrose stated if the Finance & Facilities Committee meets with others about this recommendation, he feels it is critical that the institutions are also invited for feedback.

Ms. Metcalf stated that a bill had been introduced in the House that would require a building costing more than \$10 million in State funds to be a LEED certified building. There is a push toward this kind of design.

### **III. Comprehensive Permanent Improvement Plans and Staff Visits**

Ms. Metcalf distributed a copy of the 2006 CPIP Visit Schedule and a schedule for Finance and Facilities in 2006.

### **IV. Updated CHE Policy and Procedures Manual**

Ms. Metcalf distributed a copy of the updated CHE Policy and Procedures Manual. She stated that this manual incorporates the permanent improvement requirements of the Budget and Control Board and the Joint Bond Review Committee. Ms. Metcalf stated that the Commission uses Year 2 of the CPIP as the capital project request and that is the one that is prioritized. There has been a lot of discussion on prioritizing. Last year the Commission adopted the CPIP guidelines unanimously at the Finance and Facilities Committee level. At the Commission level, there was some concern. It eventually was adopted, but the concern addressed prioritizing everything in one group, not just first priority. The problem from the staff perspective is that CPIP was done before the priority criteria was developed and finalized, so some institutions had eight projects, some with three, and some with one. She asked the institutions to be reasonable in making requests.

### **V. Other Business**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet K. Stewart  
Recorder

**Recommendations of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education to Review the Higher Education Facilities Approval Process**

In March 2006, the Committee on Finance and Facilities discussed a number of concerns about the length of time currently required for the approval of capital projects. The current approval process requires a significant amount of time between the planning and delivery of construction projects which can be up to a year in some cases. The Committee believes that if the timeframe were shortened, it would allow the institutions to develop more accurate budgets and reduce cost increases caused by delays. In May 2006, the Finance and Facilities Committee appointed a subcommittee to review the higher education facilities approval process. The goal of the subcommittee was to examine ways in which to make the approval process more efficient when addressing issues such as deferred maintenance, project delays and budget increases, and the overall approval timeline. The subcommittee members were:

- Ms. Rosemary Byerly, CHE Commissioner
- Mr. Dan Ravenel, CHE Commissioner
- Mr. Jim Sanders, CHE Commissioner
- Mr. Neal Workman, CHE Commissioner
- Mr. Walter Hardin, Winthrop University
- Mr. Rick Puncke, Jr., USC Upstate
- Mr. Thomas Suttles, Clemson University (initially Lander University)
- Mr. Dale Wilson, Piedmont Technical College
- Mr. Charles Shawver, Budget and Control Board
- Ms. Lynn Metcalf, CHE Staff
- Dr. John Sutusky, CHE Consultant & former Director of Planning & Special Projects at MUSC

The subcommittee met four times to identify and clarify the issues and to develop appropriate recommendations. The subcommittee received input and advice from Interim State Engineer Alan Carter and several facilities officers at the institutions. The recommendations are presented in institutional priority order.

The Commission on Higher Education approved the recommendations on August 2, 2006. CHE staff is in the process of determining the steps necessary to implement the recommendations.

.....  
**1.) RECOMMENDATION: The State’s Comprehensive Permanent Improvement Plan (CPIP) process should be made meaningful. (State Code and/or behavior change)**

***RATIONALE:*** CPIP, as initially conceived, has much to offer in support of rational planning and the timely approval of permanent improvement projects. What is largely lacking is a commitment from the State to consider CPIPs, especially projects for the ensuing fiscal year, in a timely manner. The untimely consideration of CPIPs has resulted in a process that has become ineffective.

It is counterproductive for the State to require CPIPs and then approve them midway through the fiscal year the plan addresses. In recent years, CPIPs have not been presented to the State's Budget and Control Board for review and approval.

CPIP was established in part to ensure the one-time State approval of an institution's work plan for the ensuing fiscal year (Year 1). Adherence to this principle would allow most of the routine interim permanent approval requests to be processed at staff level.

A reinvigorated CPIP process would have the following benefits:

- Review and approval of all permanent improvement projects for the ensuing fiscal year could be obtained prior to the beginning of the fiscal year. The CPIP process should follow the timeline of the State budget cycle.
- Institutions would annually assess the extent of their deferred maintenance problem and progress.
- Institutions would address how they will maintain existing facilities in an acceptable manner.
- Institutions would define their construction needs.

Year 2 requests in a CPIP constitute an institution's request for State Capital Improvement Bond funds. The Year 2 projects requested need not be considered by the State on the same timeline as Year 1 projects. Year 2 requests, however, are to be supported with feasibility/planning studies as described above. Further, no request would be approved unless it is consistent with the institution's facilities master plan and the institution's approved mission.

Year 3, 4 and 5 projects are more conceptual and give evidence of an institution's future facility planning.

2.) RECOMMENDATION: 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. (State Code change)

*RATIONALE:* Institutions should be permitted to proceed with identified repair, maintenance, and replacement of building systems detailed in their reinvigorated CPIP without requiring additional State-level approvals of individual projects.

3.) RECOMMENDATION: Adopt code changes allowing institutions to conduct feasibility/planning studies up to and including design development without requiring State-level approvals to plan. (State Law changes)

*RATIONALE:* Currently, institutions must seek State approval to do such planning if the planning exercise will likely result in a project. This costs valuable time and money and requires institutions to establish projects based on very limited knowledge. Institutional project planning should occur before the State-level project approval process is initiated.

Therefore, institutions should be allowed to complete a feasibility/planning study up to and including design development prior to seeking State project approval. This study should include: space program; schematics; cost estimate; funding plan, including a funding timeline if all funds are not currently available; a project timeline through occupancy; and a declaration of a procurement methodology.

Institutions are strongly encouraged to pursue a complete architectural and engineering selection process, in accordance with State regulations, to select a firm to conduct the aforementioned feasibility/planning study. This will allow the institution to continue with the same architectural and engineering firm for actual design, thereby realizing efficiencies.

4.) RECOMMENDATION: 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.

*RATIONALE:* The same information is required to be submitted twice by institutions (in somewhat different formats) to the Office of State Budget.

5.) RECOMMENDATION: Require each higher education institution to develop and submit for CHE approval a funding plan to bring its deferred maintenance to an acceptable level. (CHE Policy change)

*RATIONALE:* Due to the magnitude of deferred maintenance at some institutions, a multi-year plan may be required to reach this goal. Each plan developed must take into account the current deferred maintenance level plus the projected annual growth (life-cycle replacement). Most are generally aware of the critical deferred maintenance issue facing our institutions. The Comprehensive Permanent Improvement Plan (CPIP) requires that deferred maintenance be addressed. Too often these plans are incomplete or simply statements of the problem offering no long-term solution. The State needs to take this issue seriously as evidenced through its review and acceptance of CPIPs.

6.) RECOMMENDATION: 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 November 1, 2006. (State Code changes)

*RATIONALE:* Alternative delivery systems – alternatives to design-bid-build – are used in more than 70 percent of non-residential European construction and well over 50 percent in Japan.

During the past two decades, because of the inherent advantages of alternative delivery, the use of design-build and its variations has greatly accelerated in the United States' public and private sectors.

The benefits of alternative delivery systems include: single entity responsibility for architectural, engineering, design, and construction services; improved project definition through the collaborative planning efforts of designers, engineers, constructors, and owners at the earlier stages of project conceptualization; enhanced project quality; cost savings, time savings, and reduced State Agency administrative burden; realization of "best value" rather than "low bid;" and perhaps most importantly, the early knowledge of realistic construction costs.

For many State construction projects, there are inarguable advantages with alternative delivery as contrasted to conventional design-bid-build.

The State has a process in place that makes alternative delivery permissible in South Carolina. However, further examination reveals that the process, as it now exists, is inconsistent with sound alternative delivery methods. The existing State process needs to be evaluated and made consistent with current accepted practices used in private and other governmental sectors.

**Review Capital Improvement Bond (CIB) Request Prioritization Criteria**

CHE requests additional information for CPIP Year 2 requests for Capital Improvement Bond funds in order to score and prioritize the requests. The prioritization process is now in its third year. In order to assist CHE staff, we strongly encourage all institutions to continue to submit all components of the criteria in order to be eligible for the maximum allowable points. Provided below are the criteria as well as key areas highlighted to indicate measures generally needing improvement.

.....  
**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 deferred 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 on related standards and rating criteria. A maximum of 100 points may be generated through related standards and a maximum of 100 points may be generated through the rating criteria. Projects will be rated according to the total combined number of points generated up to a maximum of 200 points.

.....  
**SECTION I – RELATED STANDARDS**

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

❖ **STANDARD 1. The degree to which the proposed project is critical and central to the institution’s approved mission. (Up to 24 points)**

➤ **EVALUATION**

- a. Evaluated against approved mission statement augmented by institution data if available.

❖ **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 plus confirming documentation = 24
  - ii. Equal to or under standard but no confirming documentation = 20
  - iii. Over standard plus confirming documentation = 20
  - iv. Deferred Maintenance, multiple buildings = 12
  - v. 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 2006 space factor for classroom utilization, augmented by institutional data if available (studies showing that additional space or different space is needed)
  - i. Under standard plus confirming documentation = 20
  - ii. Over standard plus external documentation of library deficiencies = 20
  - iii. Over standard plus confirming documentation = 12
  - iv. Under standard, no documentation = 10
  - v. Deferred Maintenance, multiple buildings = 6
  - vi. Over standard but no documentation or documentation N/A = 0

❖ **STANDARD 4. The degree of non-capital improvement bond funding included in the project and/or documented savings and/or operational cost increase avoidance. (up to 12 points)**

1. **EVALUATION**

- a. Information from CPIP, augmented by data provided by institution if available
  - i. Documented external funding of 25% or more + operational savings = 12
  - ii. Documented external funding of 25% or more of total request = 10
  - iii. Documented external funding <25% = 8
  - iv. Expected operational savings only = 6
  - v. Deferred Maintenance, multiple buildings = 6

❖ **STANDARD 5. The proposed project is consistent with the institution's Facilities Master Plan. (Up to 10 points)**

1. **EVALUATION**

- a. Verification that project is included in master plan and how it relates to the overall plan
  - 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 10 points)**

1. **EVALUATION**

- a. Documentation included in CPIP – 10
- b. Information from CPIP – i.e., if renovation possible but not considered in new construction – 5

**Maximum Points for Standards = 100**

.....  
**SECTION II – RATING CRITERIA**

❖ **HEALTH & SAFETY (up to 25 points)**

1. **The degree to which an existing condition can be documented to be unsafe and unhealthy for human well being.**

➤ **EVALUATION**

a. **Verified by external study or institutional evaluation:**

- i. Air quality issues or code issues accepted previously (no external study) = 5.00
- ii. Air quality, or other code issues (external study) = 6.00
- iii. Citations for air quality, serious code issues or serious life safety issues (external study) = 8.34\*

*\*(to qualify for points in 2 & 3 below, institution must receive maximum here)*

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

➤ **EVALUATION**

- a. **Direct institutional verification** or in CPIP (only if maximum points in 1a)

3. **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**

- a. Information from CPIP, studies on file at CHE, and institutional documentation if provided (only if maximum points in 1a)

- i. Institutional verification that activities could not be conducted in alternate facilities so as to require discontinuance/or deferred maintenance = 8.33

❖ **DEFERRED MAINTENANCE (up to 25 points)**

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

➤ **EVALUATION**

- a. 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>
90-100	0
80-89	5
70-79	10
0-69	12.5
Infrastructure/Def. Maint. (multiple buildings)	12.5
New Construction or N/A	0

2. The degree to which the institution’s expenditures for building maintenance compare with the amount generated for building maintenance<sup>1</sup> in the MRR (according to the percent funded) using a rolling average for the most recent three-year period.

➤ **EVALUATION**

- a. 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) and averaged for the most recent three-year period.
  - i. Expenditure for E&G maintenance equal to or greater than MRR estimates = 12.5
  - ii. Expenditure not reported but data for estimate available to CHE = 12.5
  - iii. Expenditure less than MRR estimate or not reported and estimate not available = 0

❖ **ENROLLMENT & PROGRAMMATIC GROWTH (up to 25 points)**

1. 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**

- a. Data to be supplied by institution
  - i. External confirming documentation/data = 12.5
  - ii. Internal confirming documentation/data = 10
  - iii. Deferred Maintenance = 5
  - iv. None Reported or N/A = 0

2. 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**

a. Data to be supplied by institution, if applicable.

- i. If none can be met based on program of study or deferred maintenance = 12.5
- ii. If all dedicated to distance learning = 12.5.
- iii. If can be partially met = 8.5
- iv. No documentation or N/A = 0

❖ **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (up to 25 points)**

1. The degree to which the proposed project can be shown to be consistent with the State's and/or service area's priorities for continuing economic development as defined by appropriate economic development entities (e.g., State, Local, or Regional Departments of Commerce).

➤ **EVALUATION**

a. Documented evidence – 8.34

2. The degree to which the proposed project is a critical component of an articulated State, regional, or community comprehensive economic development plan.

➤ **EVALUATION**

a. Documented evidence – 8.33

3. The degree to which the proposed project can be shown to be consistent with the State's and/or service area's priorities for continuing economic development as defined by appropriate economic development entities (e.g., State, Local, or Regional Departments of Commerce).

➤ **EVALUATION**

a. Documented evidence of funding amounts– 8.33

**Maximum Points for Rating Criteria = 100**

.....

❖ **OTHER CONSIDERATION – 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.)*

*If applied, based on previously funded by CIB = 2 to 5 additional points, based on documented CIB amounts*

\*If percentage of previous amount funded is greater than 25% of the current request = 5

\*If percentage of previous amount funded is less than 25% of the current request = 2

.....

<sup>1</sup>**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.

### **Building Condition Survey – 2007 Update**

Every three years, institutions evaluate the education and general (E&G) buildings on their campuses in order to estimate deferred maintenance needs. The evaluations are used to calculate building condition codes which are submitted to the CHE Management Information System (CHEMIS). The codes are used to calculate a three-year average when evaluating requests for Capital Improvement Bonds and responding to legislative requests.

The proposed schedule is as follows:

- **March 2007** – CHE staff will send the survey instructions and worksheets to the facilities officers.
- **June 2007** – Institutions will complete the building evaluations and return to CHE.
- **July 2007** – Staff will select a random sample and conduct site visits to validate institutional reports.
- **August 2007** – Staff will send institutions the compiled data to be reviewed and affirmed by the institutions. Once all edits are completed, CHE will validate the final report.
- **September 2007** – Institutional facilities offices are expected to share the information with the data managers at their institutions in order to have the correct information submitted to CHEMIS by the October deadline.

**New Approval Submission Procedure for CHE Approvals**

Beginning in January 2007, the CHE Finance & Facilities Committee will consider permanent improvement projects on a different schedule. Projects will be considered by the Committee one month prior to consideration by the Commission. For example, a project submitted by the appropriate deadline in January will be considered by the Committee in February and the Commission in March.

In order to ensure as seamless as a transition as possible, facilities officers should notify all appropriate staff members of this change. Accordingly, we ask for your assistance in submitting projects which require Committee action by the appropriate deadlines. The Committee has stated their reluctance to consider last-minute requests.

The 2007 Finance & Facilities Committee draft schedule is attached.

**FINANCE & FACILITIES MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2007**  
(All dates and times are subject to change)

<u>Deadlines for Project Submissions for Committee &amp; Commission Agendas</u> →	<u>Finance &amp; Facilities Committee Meetings</u> →	<u>CHE Meetings</u>
		January 4, 2007 @ 11 a.m
December 8, 2006	January 4, 2007 @ 9:00 a.m	February 1, 2007 @ 11 a.m
January 17, 2007	February 1, 2007 @ 9:00 a.m (College of Charleston)	March 1, 2007 @ 11 a.m
February 14, 2007	March 1, 2007 @ 9:00 a.m	April 5, 2007 @ 11 a.m
March 21, 2007	April 5, 2007 @ 9:00 a.m	May 3, 2007 @ 11 a.m
April 18, 2007	May 2, 2007 @ 3:00 p.m.	June 7, 2007 @ 11 a.m (Orangeburg-Calhoun TC)
July 18, 2007	July 31, 2007 @ 3:00 p.m.	September 6, 2007 @ 11 a.m
August 22, 2007	September 5, 2007 @ 3:00 p.m.	October 4, 2007 @ 11 a.m
September 19, 2007	October 4, 2007 @ 9:00 a.m	November 1, 2007 @ 11 a.m
October 17, 2007	November 1, 2007 @ 9:00 a.m	December 6, 2007 @ 11 a.m
November 21, 2007	December 6, 2007 @ 9:00 a.m	January 3, 2008 @ 11 a.m
December 10, 2007	January 3, 2008 @ 9:00 a.m (Tentative meeting date; project deadline still enforced.)	February 7, 2008 @ 11 a.m

**Advisory Committee Meetings**

Facilities Advisory Committee

Tuesday, February 13, 2007 – 10:30 a.m.

Tuesday, October 9, 2007 – 10:30 a.m.

Funding Advisory Committee

Tuesday, April 17, 2007 – 10:30 a.m.

Thursday, June 28, 2007 – 10:30 a.m.

*All meetings are scheduled to be held in the CHE Main Conference Room unless otherwise noted. Room changes, if necessary, will be noted on the agenda. Please note meeting times vary.*