Attendees:

- **Committee Members:**
  
  **(Present)**
  - Lisa Alvarez-Cohen, Vice Provost, Academic Planning [CRC Co-Chair]
  - Sally McGarahan, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Services [CRC Co-Chair]
  - Shannon Holloway, Director, Capital Projects
  - Patrick Goff, Executive Director, Environmental Health & Safety
  - Adile Quennarouch, Director, Finance & Capital Asset Strategies
  - Jennifer Wolch, Dean, College of Environmental Design
  - Ella Callow, ADA/Section 504 Compliance Officer
  - Arpad Horvath, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering
  - Kira Stoll, Director of Sustainability
  - Bruce Chamberlain, Campus Energy Manager
  
  **(Absent)**
  - Jack Moehle, Professor, College of Engineering
  - Jennifer Ahern, CAPRA member, School of Public Health
  - Walter Wong, University Registrar

- **Staff/Guests:**
  
  - Susan Fish, Associate Director, Asset Management [CRC Manager]
  - Sarah Viducich, Planner, Academic Planning
  - Ben Perez, Manager, Campus Access Services
  - John Arvin, Associate Vice Chancellor, Capital Strategies
  - Connie Hsu, Assistant Director, Finance & Capital Asset Strategies
  - William Reichle, Interim Chief of Staff, Academic Planning

---

### Agenda Item

#### 1. Discussion Item – Review CR Program Summary

- The Committee reviewed remaining Capital Renewal funding dating back to FY13 Program as well as the highest known risks that CRP could be asked to address in the near-term with these fund balances. Goal to spend down remaining funds from older program years. Potential projects include:
  - Shoring risk underneath the pool in the basement of Hearst Gymnasium.
  - Emergency generators at 2000 Carleton St.; Carleton is an Emergency Management Functional Center but lacks emergency capacity for this function. This project will likely cost close to $2M, requiring further evaluation to determine if the investment is worthwhile. Sustainability Director suggested that planning for emergency management function be coordinated with current planning for potential solar project at Carleton.
  - Water intrusion at 5th floor slab of Life Sciences Addition, which affects operations/research on floors above and below the slab, as well as animal facilities. $300K was previously allocated for work at LSA; will use available funds to identify the pervasiveness of the problem and develop a phased design to remediate the problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Summary</th>
<th>Actions to be Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Discussion Item – Review CR Program Summary</td>
<td>The Committee reviewed remaining Capital Renewal funding dating back to FY13 Program as well as the highest known risks that CRP could be asked to address in the near-term with these fund balances. Goal to spend down remaining funds from older program years. Potential projects include:</td>
<td>Committee members should send Susan Fish any questions regarding the Deferred Maintenance Loan project report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Discussion Item – Review CR FY20 Project Evaluation Tool

- Demonstration of the new Capital Renewal Work Portal, a dashboard containing a full list of known capital renewal needs. Facilities Services Asset Managers scored all potential projects within their region according to the evaluation criteria/rubric developed by CRC last year; scores are recorded in the work portal. Top scoring 10-20 items per region will be brought to CRC for review.
- Potential projects are sorted into ‘buckets’ (e.g. building/system renewal, landscape renewal, utility renewal, Gustafson (update to accessibility), life safety). Two committee members will be assigned to review all projects within a given ‘bucket.’ Evaluators will be asked to score projects according to rubric criteria and record their scores within the work portal (which also contains project information and asset management scoring).
- Committee discussed concern that scores be appropriately calibrated amongst asset management and amongst committee members. What’s to prevent asset managers scoring projects in their region higher? They are being asked to justify scoring, meet certain criteria, using Facilities Condition Index and other metrics to standardize scores. Will discuss calibration of CRC project evaluators at the next meeting.
- How does asset management and CRC evaluate opportunity cost of funding certain projects, particularly given limited program funding? FY20 Capital Renewal Program is $10M, of which $3.96M is proposed for allocation to recurring programs (e.g. Campus Classroom Renovations).

3. Item for Approval – Review CR FY20 Program Evaluation Schedule

- At the next CRC meeting, members will be assigned projects to evaluate. Evaluators will have several weeks, until early May, to review and score projects in the work portal. Based upon these evaluations, Susan and Sally will recommend projects for inclusion in the FY20 program (that fit within available funding) for review and approval by the Committee at the May meeting. If more projects score high than funding can support, risks, tradeoffs and prioritization will be discussed at May meeting.
- Committee agreed to schedule and next steps.
- ICAMP project underway to quantify DM; Seismic list will be complete in June. Going forward, CRP will coordinate seismic and DM/operational risk when planning projects.
- Dean Wolch expressed concern that in the past seismic projects have not addressed DM needs or taken the opportunity to renovate
buildings that need it; how do we better coordinate projects and not leave opportunities on the table? Because there is limited funding to address complete building renewals, focus will be on seismic corrections unless building warrants strategic renewal.

- Professor Horvath noted that we have better and better data but less and less money; at what point do we use this information to push for more funding? These data will inform submittals to UCOP; ICAMP project will also be used to demonstrate huge system-wide DM need and request funding from the State.

| 4. Item for Approval – Capital Renewal Delegation Proposed Increase to CPC for approval | Request to increase CRC co-chair delegation of authority for project approvals from $500K to $750K. Currently any change within the CRP program over $500K (e.g. augmenting a project with CRP reserves) requires the approval of CPC, which can cause project delays (e.g. Morgan Hall elevator project is delayed because the augmentation requires CPC approval).
- Note that CPC still approves full annual Capital Renewal Program and the delegation of authority does not increase the total CRP budget, it only gives the CRC authority to reallocate funds within the existing program budget.
- Why not ask for delegation of authority up to $1M? Few emergent projects or augmentations meet that threshold. There is a benefit to keeping CRC on CPC radar and cognizant of tradeoffs that CRC has to make.
- Increased delegation of authority threshold approved by CRC. | Request CPC approval for revision to CRC Delegation of Authority |