

CAPITAL RENEWAL COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

August 20, 2018; 11:00 am.; Chancellor’s Conference Room, California Hall

<p>Attendees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee Members: (Present) Lisa Alvarez-Cohen, Vice Provost, Academic Planning [CRC Co-Chair] Sally McGarrah, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Services [CRC Co-Chair] Shannon Holloway, Director, Capital Projects Patrick Goff, Executive Director, Environmental Health & Safety Walter Wong, University Registrar Adile Quennarouch, Director, Finance & Capital Asset Strategies Jennifer Wolch, Dean, College of Environmental Design (Absent) Jennifer Ahern, CAPRA member, School of Public Health Arpad Horvath, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering Harrison Fracker, At-Large member, Architecture Jason Corburn, At-Large member, City and Regional Planning Lyle Nevels, AVC - IT and Deputy CIO Staff: Susan Fish, Associate Director, Asset Management [CRC Manager] Sarah Vidulich, Planner, Academic Planning 		
--	--	--

Agenda Item	Discussion Summary	Actions to be Taken
<p>1. Discussion Item – Incorporate DM Program Management into CRP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In additional to the annual Capital Renewal Program, campus received a \$50M loan from UCOP for Deferred Maintenance. The DM project list was approved by the Chancellor and UCOP with reporting to UCOP but there is little campus oversight of changes to the program, augmentations, etc. AVC McGarrah proposed that changes to the DM program, including funding changes, be reviewed and approved by the Capital Renewal Committee following existing CRP processes. Concern <u>was</u> raised that CRP and DM are separate programs with separate sources of funding (cash vs commercial paper) and separate reporting requirements; nenecessitating to ensure that funds are not comingled. Committee discussed ways to ensure DM projects are appropriately prioritized and <u>that</u> campus is prepared with potential projects should future State/UCOP DM money be made available <u>on a short timeline</u>. Next project in pipeline likely University Hall seismic and repairs, though even with potential State and CRP money, funding gap remains. Committee discussed funding UCOP mandate to repair or vacate seismically poor buildings by 2030. 79 buildings on campus that are suspected to be poor (about \$1B worth of projects); campus is hiring structural engineers to do (re)assessments and <u>to developing</u> a plan to deal with critical buildings. Will likely be a combination of campus, State and UCOP funds to address seismic program. Committee approved incorporation of assessing Deferred Maintenance projects <u>Program using into</u> existing Capital Renewal Program Management framework. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bring future changes to the DM program to CRC for review and approval.
<p>2. Discussion Item – Revise Delegation of Authority: Funding Approval Limits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal to revise the delegation of authority for CRP actions that require the review of CPC from \$500K to \$750K to streamline the process and <u>to</u> keep CPC focused on a higher, more strategic level. Concern raised that with a \$10M program, a \$750K project or augmentation is a significant percentage of the program. Committee <u>voted 6-2 to approved</u> raising the delegation of authority threshold from \$500K to \$750K. <u>Item passed and co-</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bring revised delegation of authority to CPC for approval.

CAPITAL RENEWAL COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

August 20, 2018; 11:00 am.; Chancellor’s Conference Room, California Hall

	<p><u>Chair Alvarez-Cohen agreed to communicate to CPC the dissenting opinion.</u></p>	
<p>3. Discussion Item – Review Project Evaluation Process for FY19: Lessons Learned</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new Capital Renewal evaluation process was utilized to prioritize the FY19 program. Committee discussed lessons learned and made the following suggestions to improve the FY20 project evaluation process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Start <u>the</u> evaluation process in February or March to provide adequate time for reviewers to do a thorough evaluation. ○ Project information should be <u>simplified-summarized</u> and easier to sort through. ○ Would be helpful for reviewers to confer about the projects. ○ Need a calibration exercise to improve consistency of scores, or <u>a norming mechanisms that provides</u> each reviewer <u>with</u> a set number of points that they must allocate across all projects to ensure that no one is a more or less generous scorer. ○ Rather than having two people do the full evaluation of a subset of projects <u>on all criteria</u>, it <u>would-might</u> be beneficial for the same reviewer(s) <u>to-reviewrate</u> all projects <u>but-only on</u> the question(s) that fall within their expertise. ○ Hold a kick off meeting for the reviewers to provide an overview of <u>all-each of</u> the projects, discuss scoring criteria and help set calibration. ○ Need to make the evaluation worksheet language more precise (e.g. student experience – need more guidance as to how to measure this, provide examples of different ranges of contribution). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify the evaluation worksheet per discussion. • Finalize revised evaluation process at next committee meeting.
<p>4. Discussion Item – Committee Membership</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee agreed that there are not enough members <u>to effectively review the proposed projects</u>, particularly faculty representatives, and not enough different perspectives on the committee. • Proposal to identify gaps in committee membership and <u>to</u> add additional faculty members with technical expertise (e.g. landscape and sustainability expertise, student experience representative). • Committee agreed to add additional members to the CRC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee to propose new members (either area of expertise or a specific name) to CRC Manager.