



# South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

Mr. Kenneth B. Wingate, Chair  
Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Vice Chair  
Douglas R. Forbes, D.M.D.  
Mr. Kenneth W. Jackson  
Dr. Raghu Korrapati  
Ms. Cynthia C. Mosteller  
Mr. James R. Sanders  
Mr. Y. W. Scarborough, III  
Mr. Charles L. Talbert, III, CPA  
Mr. Guy C. Tarrant, CCIM  
Mr. Hood Temple  
Charles B. Thomas, Jr., M.D.  
Mr. Neal J. Workman, Jr.  
Dr. Mitchell Zais

Dr. Garrison Walters, Executive Director

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** November 10, 2009  
**TO:** Members, Facilities Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Mr. Gary S. Glenn, Director of Finance, Facilities, & MIS  
**SUBJECT:** Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting, November 17

The Facilities Advisory Committee will meet on Tuesday, November 17, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission's Main 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  
NOVEMBER 17, 2009  
10:00 A.M.  
MAIN CONFERENCE ROOM  
COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION  
1333 MAIN STREET, SUITE 200  
COLUMBIA, SC 29201

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Minutes from October 21, 2008
3. Legislative Update on Regulatory Relief – Julie Carullo
4. Submission of FY 2010-11 CPIP to CHE
  - a. No CPIP Year 2-5 in FY 2010-11 per proviso 89.121
5. CPIP lists attached to project write-ups for Commission approval to show prioritization
6. Including anticipated delivery method in project description on A-1 for phase I and confirmation or revision of delivery method chosen on A-1 for phase II
7. Building Data Summary
  - a. Making sure data is reported correctly – ownership status of building, % E&G based on room use codes
  - b. Maintenance of Leased Space
    - Option for collecting data on leased spaces – take the amount that is being spent on maintenance and divide by 3% - the result should give an accurate replacement cost.
8. Building Condition Survey
  - a. Consideration of % E&G space in calculating maintenance needs (25% rule)
  - b. Update and Maintain – 1 sheet with elevator, 1 sheet without elevator
  - c. Re-survey January 2011
9. Other Business
  - a. Next Meeting

**MINUTES**

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION  
FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
OCTOBER 21, 2008  
10:30 A.M.  
FIRST FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM IN CHE BUILDING

**Committee Members Present**

Mr. Gary Glenn, *Chair*  
Mr. Bob Wells, *Clemson*  
Mr. John Malmrose, *MUSC*  
Mr. Dewey Yeatts, *The Citadel*  
Ms. Sandy Williams, *Coastal Carolina*  
Mr. Mike Jara, *USC Aiken*  
Mr. Rick Puncke, *USC Upstate*  
Ms. Michele Featherstone, *SC Technical College Office System*  
Mr. Tuck Hanna, *Greenville TC*  
Mr. Dale Wilson, *Piedmont TC*

**Committee Members Absent**

Mr. Tom Quasney, *USC Columbia*  
Ms. Monica Scott, *College of Charleston*  
Mr. Ralph Davis, *Francis Marion*

Mr. Jeff Beaver, *Lander*  
Ms. Betty Jenkins, *SC State University*  
Mr. Mike Parrott, *USC Beaufort*  
Mr. Walter Hardin, *Winthrop*  
Mr. Bruce Blumberg, *USC Sumter*  
Mr. Dennis Rogers, *Aiken TC*

**Guests**

Ms. Donna Collins, *USC Columbia*  
Mr. Jeff Lamberson, *USC Columbia*  
Ms. Ginger Hudock, *USC Aiken*  
Mr. Craig Hess, *Midlands TC*  
Mr. Charles Shawver, *Budget & Control Board*

**CHE Staff**

Ms. Courtney Blake

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 10:35 a.m. He welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked the attendees to introduce themselves.

**I. Approval of Minutes from February 12, 2008 Meeting**

Since there were no additions or corrections to the Minutes of the meeting on February 12, it was moved, seconded, and voted to approve the Minutes as written.

**II. Alternative Construction Delivery**

Mr. Glenn asked Ms. Ginger Hudock, from the University of South Carolina Aiken, to speak about the use of the Design Build Process for one of their projects.

Ms. Hudock explained that the University of South Carolina Aiken began the process of emphasizing student housing about ten years ago. The only housing that was available at the time was a 365 bed apartment style complex that was located on the University's land, but was owned by a private developer. In 1999 the University purchased that apartment complex. Soon thereafter a need for more student housing became evident. In 2002 the housing foundation built a dormitory, but the need for more housing was still there.

USC Aiken wanted to build a third residence hall and wanted it completed within two years. This is when they decided to use the design build process. When the process began they had

general specifications of what the residence hall was to consist of, they specified the site, but they decided to let the successful bidder design the building. The fast paced timeline is where Ms. Hudock feels the most money was saved. She stated that the construction was finished in less than a year, which was three months under what they projected. She also noted that there was an estimated cost of \$16.5 mil. for this particular project, but by shaving off a year from conception to finish they saved roughly \$700,000.

Ms. Hudock went on to explain that there is a two step process when using Design Build. The first step is a request for qualifications (RFQ). During this stage the institution gave companies a general scope of what they wanted to do; they explained what the selection process was going to be like, and the evaluation criteria. Ms. Hudock noted that the reason for a two step process is because when a contractor gets into the design phase they are out a good bit of money. Once the University has a small group of contractors to choose from, all of those contractors have plans that are ready to be built. They do all of the design work up front.

The University had five RFQ Responses. They were required to choose at least two, but chose three firms for their short list. These firms then had to respond for a request for proposal (RFP). The request for proposal is the second step in the two step process. In this particular situation Ms. Hudock explained that the top three firms were given the RFP in October and had to have a response, with completed plans, by December. Each firm then gave a presentation, negotiations began, and a firm was selected in January. Plans were finalized and they were ready to start building in February. Ms. Hudock noted that another positive in using the Design Build Process is that the University did not have to strictly use the low bid. They were able to look at the cost up front as well as the design when making their decision. This also allowed for more negotiation room.

The winning firm was one that the University had used before, so they knew that they would get quality work. This firm also specialized in student housing, and put in sustainable design when constructing the new residence hall.

Mr. Glenn asked Mr. Bob Wells, from Clemson University, to share comments on using Design Build under the new system. Mr. Wells explained to the committee that Clemson is currently in the middle of Design Build on their Innovation Center. He noted that one big difference is now institutions have to get approval from the State Engineer's office. Mr. Wells stated that it was hard to get approval from them which slowed down the process.

Mr. Wells went on to explain that the University had to hire an A&E firm to put together significant design criteria for the proposers to look at and put a price on. In Mr. Wells's opinion, this step went beyond schematics. After this step was completed they went out for proposals, selected the best firm, and then opened up price to start negotiations. The University is still working on finalizing negotiations.

Mr. John Malmrose, from the Medical University of South Carolina, asked why they took the project all the way to schematics in the first phase. Mr. Wells replied that the State Engineers Office gave the direction to take the project to schematics. Mr. Glenn asked if the University did pre-design for this project. Mr. Wells confirmed that they did. Mr. Wells also voiced his concern for using Design Build under the new Phased Process. He noted that the University will have to choose a builder to start design prior to approval for the second phase for construction. The University will be stuck having to figure out how to pay for the construction before the construction money and phase is approved.

### **III. Capital Project Approval for Technical Colleges**

Mr. Glenn introduced the topic. A handout was given to the Committee members that explained 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 State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education (SBTCE). Mr. Glenn noted that staff will accept A-1's before the board approves the project, but that the projects will have to be suspended until notice of the State Board approval. Tuck Hanna, from Greenville Technical College, stated that the CHE meeting schedule along with the State Tech Board and Budget and Control Board's schedules should coincide. Donna Collins, from the University of South Carolina Columbia, asked if CHE staff would approve a project if the University's Board meeting fell in-between CHE staff's project submission date and the Commission's meeting date. Mr. Glenn confirmed that in that situation CHE staff would approve the project contingent upon the Board's approval.

### **IV. Comprehensive Permanent Improvement Project (CPIP) Scoring**

Mr. Glenn explained to the Committee that he would be taking the CPIP year two results to the CHE Finance & Facilities Committee at its November meeting. He noted that while going back through the scores he and Ms. Blake found some inconsistencies which instigated changes to the CPIP scoring.

Mr. Glenn explained the proposed changes. He stated that in the first standard we propose that it not only state that the project must be critical and central to the institutions mission, but that it also must be part of the institutions master plan. Mr. Bob Wells, from Clemson University, asked what exactly we meant by "consistent with the master plan." Mr. Glenn replied that it must be on the drawing that the institutions board approves. Mr. John Malmrose, from the Medical University of South Carolina, asked that there be some flexibility. He stated that for MUSC some of their projects are opportunistic. He explained that their master plan is more of a concept on how they want to use their land. Mr. Glenn agreed that there would need to be some flexibility there, but that by adding this credential to the standards hopefully the institutions will update their master plans and keep CHE in the loop when a building is added.

Mr. Glenn noted minor changes to standard two. He continued to standard three noting that it use to be a maximum of 24 points which has been revised to 20 points. The biggest change in this standard is making a separate line for projects that are for libraries only. These points are specifically warranted when SACS comes and says that if the institution doesn't fix their library they will lose accreditation. John Malmrose, from MUSC, asked if there were measurements for awarding these points. Mr. Glenn replied that we were looking for external documentation of deficiencies. Ms. Ginger Hudock, from USC Aiken, added that an accreditation deficiency could exist in other buildings besides just in libraries. Members of the committee agreed that Standard 3aii should read: External documentation of accreditation deficiencies = 20 pts.

Mr. Glenn explained that in standard four we found that we were awarding points to the Technical schools for having local support for new construction projects which they had to have regardless. That local support was also being counted again in the economic development section of the scoring. Another issue found in this standard was the awarding of points if a project had funding less than 25%; this could mean \$1.00 would warrant 8 points. Mr. Glenn noted that he felt that this particular standard was important in discriminating between projects that should get state support and those projects that should not.

Mr. Glenn stated that standard five use to be where the project was awarded points for being on the master plan. He explained that since that criterion had been moved to standard one, standard five is now for Documented Operational Savings or Documented Reduction in Maintenance Needs. Ms. Donna Collins, from USC Columbia, asked to what extent was CHE scoring maintenance needs. Mr. Glenn replied that we did not get that detailed with it, and that we are simply looking for a reduction in maintenance needs. Ms. Collins also asked in regards to operational savings, is CHE requiring external documentation or just looking for an institutionally determined estimate. Mr. Glenn confirmed that it could be based on an institutionally determined guess.

Mr. Glenn noted that standard six was changed from a maximum of 10 points to 6 points and points would be rewarded if documentation is included in the CPIP. In section two Mr. Glenn asked members for help with standard 1a - Health & Safety. After some discussion the committee agreed to change the standard to read: 1 a,i Air quality, code issues, or life safety issues (professional study) = 15 pts. , and 1 a,ii Air quality, code issues, or life safety issues (institutional justification) = 7 pts.

Mr. Glenn went through the rest of the proposed changes to the CPIP scoring without any further questions or objections from committee members.

## **V. Managing Maintenance Needs**

Mr. Glenn noted that each institution did a lot of work to assess each building in order to gather information on maintenance needs. He stressed that now we have the information we need to figure out how to manage and maintain that information so that it does not become insignificant. Mr. Glenn pointed out that every time maintenance repairs are made to the buildings and we don't capture the affect on the evaluations, we lose the value of our initial effort. Mr. Glenn proposed that when an institution gets to the construction phase of a project, for them to go back to the original evaluation sheet, created in Fall 2007, and tell CHE how the current work is affecting that assessment. This exercise will determine how projects affect the maintenance needs evaluations. When institutions re-evaluate the assessment, the building condition code will change which will also change the overall maintenance needs of that building. Donna Collins, from USC Columbia, asked if the institutions should adjust the replacement cost for the year that the construction is occurring, or should they continue to use the historical cost. Mr. Glenn replied that the institutions should continue to use the historical cost because that is what we have used to aggregate the maintenance needs for the state.

Mr. Glenn noted that the problem with only updating the evaluation sheets when maintenance repairs are made is that as we are doing so the systems are still decaying. His next question to the committee was how often should we go back and re-evaluate the entire system. Mr. Glenn noted another concern: This new process would provide CHE a way to keep up with permanent improvement project (PIP) activity, but projects that are less than \$500,000 CHE would not know about. He stated that the only way for CHE to know about these minor projects is for the institutions to fill out a new sheet for internal PIP projects. He asked the committee members for suggestions on how to balance efficiency and effectiveness with this proposed process. Donna Collins suggested not worrying about minor projects because they won't make that big of a difference in the overall maintenance needs. Committee members agreed that if a project is over the \$500,000 threshold then they will send in a re-evaluation of the maintenance needs. Dale Wilson, from Piedmont Technical College, asked if the re-evaluation every three years would be optional. Mr. Rick Puncke, from USC Upstate, stated that right now there is no state money; therefore, no one is fixing anything and there is no need to report any changes. He

suggested leaving the re-evaluation on a three year rotation and if something changes the institutions have the option to report.

Mr. Glenn stated that the CHE Finance & Facilities Committee is interested in what we are doing to make maintenance needs go away. He also noted that for scoring purposes the standard is, "are the institutions spending 3% of the replacement value to maintain, and are they spending additional dollars to address these accumulated maintenance needs."

The committee members agreed that CHE will not worry about the minor renovations under \$500,000; institutions will repeat the maintenance needs survey every three years and collect information at the construction phase and validate that information at the conclusion of the project; and CHE will manage system changes based on what the institutions report and will report back annually as to what has changed.

## **VI. Discussion of Bond Bill Proposal**

Mr. Glenn explained that the Bond Bill Proposal is a three part plan. Part one addresses E&G maintenance needs. Mr. Glenn noted that with the aid of the Fall 2007 maintenance needs calculations we now have a fairly accurate number for maintenance needs in the state. He noted that the enabling legislation for technical schools makes maintenance a local issue. The local community is responsible for maintaining campuses while the state shares the responsibility to provide for renovation and new construction. The legislation does not give the state responsibility to maintain technical colleges; therefore, with the exception of Denmark Technical College and Technical College of the Lowcountry, the technical colleges are not included for funding of maintenance needs in the Bond Bill Proposal.

Mr. Glenn noted that this could have a positive outcome because the technical colleges can go back to their local governments and reinforce the fact that the state will not be able to provide for maintenance needs. Mr. Dale Wilson, from Piedmont Technical College, stated that relying on local government to provide for maintenance needs assumes that they will provide 100%. Mr. Glenn replied that each of the technical colleges enabling legislation states that the local government will be responsible for maintaining the campuses. Mr. Wilson asked for that information to be verified because he believes that the statutes are different for each county.

Mr. Glenn explained how the allocation of maintenance needs funding was determined based on E&G SF to total E&G SF weighted to consider the age of the building that includes the E&G space (based on the year of construction). Mr. Wilson asked for clarification that the intent is to recommend to the Commission that all technical colleges, except for Denmark and Technical College of the Lowcountry, be eliminated from any state support for maintenance needs. Mr. Glenn confirmed and reminded Mr. Wilson that in the MRR there is no allocation for physical plant for technical colleges. Mr. Wilson stressed the point that technical colleges have received state support for maintenance needs in previous years. Mr. Glenn acknowledged that point and asked members to advise him on any other legislation that overrides the enabling legislation to allow the state to provide funding for maintenance at the technical colleges.

Mr. Glenn explained that part two of the capital budget proposal is intended to provide, through the bond bill, funding for pre-design for those projects which scored 70% (143 points) or better on CPIP. Mr. Glenn noted that by adding this step, when the next bond bill comes the pre-design number will already be identified and requests for construction would be based on the standards set by JBRC and B&CB. Mr. Glenn clarified that any project on CPIP year two that scores 143 points or more would receive 1.5% of the projects cost for pre-design.

Mr. Glenn explained part three (Construction Funding) to the committee members noting that of those buildings that received priority, total funding was awarded. He also noted that each institution that received construction funding would only receive it for one building per bond bill. Mr. Glenn stressed the fact that not all projects will get construction funding. He noted that if institutions and agencies can come together and implement the plan and stick with it, then they will be able to sell it on the fact that capital funding should be routine and predictable. This would in return mean that if an institution doesn't get construction funding in this year's bond bill then they should get it in the next bond bill.

Tuck Hanna, from Greenville Technical College, asked if this plan is going to the Commission at its November meeting as a recommendation from the Facilities Advisory Committee. Mr. Glenn replied that the plan will be coming as a recommendation from him with hopes that he could affirm he had a discussion with the committee and all were in acceptance. Mr. Hanna stated that he is not in total agreement with everything in the plan. Mr. Wilson agreed that he too was not in total agreement with the plan and suggested putting a sub note on table one. He and Mr. Hanna stressed the point that they do not want their institutions presidents to think that they signed off on this plan where maintenance needs will not be funded to the technical schools. Mr. Glenn replied that he doesn't feel comfortable asking them to do that.

## **VII. Capital Project Regulatory Relief Initiative**

Mr. Glenn introduced the Regulatory Relief Initiative noting that the committee discussed these initiatives a year ago and this was a revisit for clarification. He stated that there has been a lot of discussion of where we are with these initiatives and where we need to go with them. Mr. Glenn noted that the majority of the institutions' presidents used the term "regulatory relief" as part of their agenda in their speeches to the Commission and to Legislators, but they did not define what it is. He explained that this proposal provides recommendations for what the Legislature or JBRC or B&CB could do to make things work better.

Mr. Glenn went through the six items of recommended regulatory relief. He stressed to the committee that CHE along with the institutions need to work harder to share concerns about delays in construction and how that is effecting the cost with legislative staff so that the staff can then relay the concerns to the legislators.

While discussing the final recommendation to provide flexibility up to 20% or \$1 million within permanent improvement project budgets for budget increases only prior to additional approval by the required State entities, Mr. John Malmrose suggested to base the percentage on bid tab data. Mr. Malmrose noted that contractors who have the full benefits of knowing final construction specs and design can't all agree on one cost. The committee agreed that the revision to the last recommendation would be made to hold off on specifying a percentage and ask for flexibility. The revision was made to strike "20% or \$1 million" and add "provide flexibility for budget increases based on bid tab data."

## **VIII. Other Business**

Mr. Glenn asked members for recommendations on how to define a "campus." After debate, the committee agreed to break it down into campuses, sites, and presences. They defined each category as follows: a campus provides full time student service activities, a site consists of buildings that the institution owns or leases but does not offer an array of student service activities, and a presence is a facility that is provided to the institution for academic programs.

Mr. Glenn asked that each institution send a list of how they categorize their campuses, sites, and presences. Members asked for a reminder email with definitions of each category and criteria be sent to each facilities officer.

The next meeting of the Facilities Advisory Committee will be held in February 2009, at 10:30 a.m. The specific day is to be determined and will be sent to members as soon as the meeting schedule for 2009 has been made.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Courtney W. Blake  
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.*

**Example:**

**USC Columbia FY 2009-10 CPIP**

**2009 CPIP - Year One Summary**

| Institution  | Project   | Estimated Project Cost | IP | Proposed Source of Funds                  |
|--------------|---|------------------------|----|---|
| USC Columbia | Athletic Village Infrastructure Development Construction    | \$12,000,000           | 15 | Athletics; Athletic Revenue Bonds         |
|              | Athletic Coaches Support Building Construction              | \$20,000,000           | 16 | Athletics; Athletic Revenue Bonds         |
|              | Athletic Village Garage & Maintenance Facility Construction | \$6,500,000            | 17 | Athletics; Athletic Revenue Bonds         |
|              | Athletic Venues Construction                                | \$7,500,000            | 18 | Athletics; Athletic Revenue Bonds         |
|              | Farmers Market Development                                  | \$33,000,000           | 19 | Athletics; Athletic Revenue Bonds         |
|              | Williams-Brice Stadium West Side Suite Renovations          | \$2,800,000            | 20 | Athletics                                 |
|              | Williams-Brice Stadium South End Zone Renovations           | \$34,000,000           | 21 | Athletics; Athletic Revenue Bonds         |
|              | Preston College Fire Protection/Renovation                  | \$2,800,000            | 7  | Housing                                   |
|              | Rutledge College Renovations                                | \$1,089,570            | 8  | Housing                                   |
|              | Wade Hampton Renovations/Fire Protection                    | \$2,825,000            | 9  | Housing                                   |
|              | Woodrow College Façade Improvements/ Window Upgrades        | \$2,100,000            | 13 | Housing                                   |
|              | South Quad Exterior Waterproofing                           | \$750,000              | 14 | Housing                                   |
|              | Patterson Hall Renovation                                   | \$32,000,000           | 10 | Housing Revenue Bonds                     |
|              | McClintock Renovation/Fire Protection                       | \$5,000,000            | 11 | Housing Revenue Bonds                     |
|              | DeSaussure College Fire Protection & Renovation             | \$3,500,000            | 12 | Housing Revenue Bonds                     |
|              | Columbia Campus Utility Infrastructure Repairs              | \$1,500,000            | 1  | Institutional                             |
|              | Health Sciences Renovation                                  | \$18,000,000           | 2  | Institutional                             |
|              | Computer Annex Backup Power Installation                    | \$1,100,000            | 3  | Institutional                             |
|              | Davis College HVAC Replacement                              | \$2,000,000            | 4  | Institutional                             |
|              | South Sumter Street Streetscaping                           | \$1,000,000            | 5  | Institutional                             |
|              | Columbia Campus Elevator Upgrades                           | \$2,100,000            | 6  | Institutional Capital Project             |
|              | Moore School of Business New Facility Construction          | \$85,000,000           | 22 | Revenue Bonds; Institution Bonds; Private |

**2009 CPIP - Year Two Summary**

| Institution  | Project   | Estimated Project Cost <sup>1</sup> | IP | Proposed Source of Funds                 | Previous State Appropriations |
|--------------|---|-------------------------------------|----|--|-------------------------------|
| USC Columbia | Williams-Brice Stadium East Grandstand Renovations                            | \$104,000,000                       | 8  | Athletics; Athletic Revenue Bonds        | -                             |
|              | School of Law New Building  | \$90,400,000                        | 1  | CIB - \$20,000,000; Other - \$60,400,000 | \$10,000,000                  |
|              | Gibbes Green Historic Facilities Renovations (LeConte/Petigru/Infrastructure) | \$34,900,000                        | 2  | CIB - \$25,000,000                       | \$9,900,000                   |
|              | Utility Infrastructure Maintenance Needs                                      | \$5,000,000                         | 3  | CIB                                      | -                             |
|              | Bates West Elevator Renovation  | \$1,500,000                         | 5  | Housing                                  | -                             |
|              | Woodrow College Renovation/Fire Protection                                    | \$2,395,660                         | 6  | Housing                                  | -                             |
|              | Carolina Gardens Renovation/Fire Protection                                   | \$2,199,811                         | 7  | Housing                                  | -                             |
|              | Student Health Center   | \$55,000,000                        | 4  | Institution Bonds                        | -                             |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>\$295,395,471</b>  |                                     |    |  |                               |

<sup>1</sup>The estimated project cost includes funding previously approved.

**2009 CPIP - Year Three Summary**

| Institution  | Project  | Estimated Cost | IP | Proposed Source of Funds                    |
|--------------|--|----------------|----|---|
| USC Columbia | Williams-Brice Stadium West Grandstand Renovations               | \$91,000,000   | 12 | Athletics; Athletic Revenue Bonds           |
|              | Maintenance Needs  | \$10,000,000   | 1  | CIB   |
|              | Jones PSC Renovation - Phase II                                  | \$24,800,000   | 2  | CIB   |
|              | Gibbes Green Historic Facilities Renovations (Barnwell/Hamilton) | \$37,250,000   | 3  | CIB   |
|              | Capstone Window Replacement                                      | \$3,200,000    | 9  | Housing                                     |
|              | South Tower Fan Coil Replacement                                 | \$900,000      | 10 | Housing                                     |
|              | Columbia Hall Window Replacement                                 | \$1,989,000    | 11 | Housing                                     |
|              | Blatt P.E. Center Renovation                                     | \$45,750,000   | 5  | Institution Bonds; Athletic Revenue Bonds   |
|              | Benson School Demolition/Recreation Field Development            | \$4,800,000    | 4  | Institutional Funds                         |
|              | SOM Chiller Replacement for Buildings 1,2,4, & 110               | \$2,640,000    | 6  | Private; Tuition Bonds; Institutional Funds |
|              | SOM VA Campus Parking Lot Construction                           | \$1,320,000    | 7  | Private; Tuition Bonds; Institutional Funds |
|              | SOM Building #3 Group Study Rooms                                | \$1,800,000    | 8  | Private; Tuition Bonds; Institutional Funds |

**2009 CPIP - Year Four Summary**

| Institution  | Project  | Estimated Cost | IP | Proposed Source of Funds                    |
|--------------|--|----------------|----|---|
| USC Columbia | Williams-Brice Stadium North End Zone Renovations            | \$88,000,000   | 9  | Athletics; Athletic Revenue Bonds           |
|              | Maintenance Needs  | \$10,000,000   | 1  | CIB   |
|              | Jones PSC Renovation - Phase III                             | \$24,800,000   | 2  | CIB   |
|              | Columbia Hall Elevator Renovation                            | \$1,090,000    | 8  | Housing                                     |
|              | Cliff Apartments Renovation/Fire Protection                  | \$5,500,000    | 7  | Housing Revenue Bonds                       |
|              | Business Administration Building Renovations                 | \$25,000,000   | 3  | Institution Tuition Bonds                   |
|              | SOM VA Campus Buildings 1,2,4, & 104 Air Handler Replacement | \$3,300,000    | 4  | Private; Tuition Bonds; Institutional Funds |
|              | SOM Building #4 2nd Floor New Animal Space Renovations       | \$1,750,000    | 5  | Private; Tuition Bonds; Institutional Funds |
|              | SOM Building #3 Basement Waterproofing                       | \$650,000      | 6  | Private; Tuition Bonds; Institutional Funds |

**2009 CPIP - Year Five Summary**

| Institution  | Project  | Estimated Cost | IP | Proposed Source of Funds                    |
|--------------|--|----------------|----|---|
| USC Columbia | Williams-Brice Stadium South End Zone Bowl Renovations | \$13,000,000   | 12 | Athletics; Athletic Revenue Bonds           |
|              | Maintenance Needs                                      | \$10,000,000   | 1  | CIB   |
|              | Jones PSC Renovation - Phase IV                        | \$24,750,000   | 2  | CIB   |
|              | Coliseum Renovations                                   | \$93,050,000   | 4  | CIB   |
|              | Foundation Square Construction                         | \$10,000,000   | 6  | CIB   |
|              | Cliff Apartments Elevator Renovation                   | \$1,090,000    | 9  | Housing                                     |
|              | Bates House Roof Replacement                           | \$550,000      | 10 | Housing                                     |
|              | South Tower Window Replacement                         | \$3,200,000    | 11 | Housing Revenue Bonds                       |
|              | Law School Renovations                                 | \$67,800,000   | 3  | Institution Bonds                           |
|              | Bymes Center Demolition/Construct New Facility         | \$79,750,000   | 5  | Institution Bonds                           |
|              | SOM Medical Students' Education Area                   | \$1,250,000    | 7  | Private; Tuition Bonds; Institutional Funds |
|              | SOM Gross Lab Upgrades                                 | \$2,000,000    | 8  | Private; Tuition Bonds; Institutional Funds |

Note: Projects that are highlighted have been processed as Interim Capital Projects.