**Attendees:**
- **Committee Members:** (Present)
  - Tsu-Jae King Liu, Vice Provost, Academic & Space Planning [CRC Co-Chair]
  - Sally McFarrahan, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Services [CRC Co-Chair]
  - Shannon Holloway, Director, Capital Projects
  - Patrick Goff, Executive Director, Environmental Health & Safety
  - Walter Wong, University Registrar
  - Jennifer Ahern, CAPRA member, School of Public Health
  - Arpad Horvath, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering
  - Adile Quennarrouch, Director, Finance & Capital Asset Strategies
- (Absent)
  - Keith Gilless, Dean, CNR
  - Harrison Fracker, At-Large member, Architecture
  - Jason Corburn, At-Large member, City and Regional Planning
  - Jeremy White, Senior Program Manager, Architectural Access/Compliance
  - Lyle Nevels, AVC - IT and Deputy CIO
- **Staff:**
  - Susan Fish, Associate Director Asset Management [CRC Manager]
  - Brandon DeFrancisci, Associate Director, Environmental Health & Safety
  - Sarah Viducich, Planner, Academic & Space Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Summary</th>
<th>Actions to be Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Discussion Item – Charge Letter</td>
<td>A revised charge letter is being finalized; when approved by the EVCP it will be circulated to committee members</td>
<td>Send revised charge letter to EVCP for approval, circulate signed letter to committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discussion Item – Governing Principles</td>
<td>A workgroup of the CRC revised the governing principles of the capital renewal program, and edited/consolidated the program information presented on the website. Discussion of confusing language: difference between ongoing maintenance and capital renewal, particularly regarding utilization of maintenance work orders to identify capital renewal needs. Susan clarified that there is high cost of maintenance for systems that have exceeded their useful life.</td>
<td>Susan will revise language to clarify difference and relationship between maintenance and capital renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discussion Item – Rubric Development</td>
<td>Workgroup will have additional meetings to edit the CRP project prioritization rubric and make sure that it is consistent with the revised governing principles. In order to prepare a proposed capital renewal program for FY19 in a timely fashion, the workgroup needs to refine the rubric in March and circulate it afterwards to the CRC. An April CRC meeting will be set up to test the rubric with sample projects and approve a final version. The committee will need to determine who will be responsible for scoring each criterion across all projects. All of the proposed projects for the FY19 CRP will be scored using the finalized rubric in May, to develop a proposed CRP to recommend to CPC in June.</td>
<td>Workgroup will meet to revise rubric in March and circulate to CRC members electronically. Schedule additional CRC meeting for April to review and finalize rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Discussion Item – Financial Strategy</td>
<td>Susan proposed to release remaining CRP debt capacity from prior fiscal years and replace with cash balances from the capital renewal provisional account (unspent or returned project funds) and capital renewal fee account. Susan and Budget Office will perform forensic accounting to assess fungibility of cash in provisional and CRF accounts to determine if/how it can be used for CRP projects.</td>
<td>Susan and Budget Office to perform analysis of provisional and CRF accounts to identify available cash balances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discussion Item – Process Flow Diagram</td>
<td>CRC endorsed the suggestion create a process flow diagram to show how potential CRP projects are identified and how they are approved by the committee, to post on the CRP website</td>
<td>Develop CRP process flow diagram for review at the next CRC meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>