University of Rhode Island  
Strategic Budget and Planning Council  
Thursday, March 10, 2016, 9:00-10:30 am  
Ballentine Hall, Thomson Board Room

Members in Attendance:  
Don DeHayes (Chair), Christina L. Valentino, Linda Barrett, Sharon Bell, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Wendy Bucci, Steven D’Hondt, Rachel DiCioccio, Mary Jo Gonzales, Lindsey McLennan, Trish Morokoff, Ann Morrissey, Ellen Reynolds, Gerry Sonnenfeld, Naomi Thompson

Members Absent: Thorr Bjorn, Lori Ciccomascolo, John Kirby, Ken Kermes, Amanda Rode, Joelle Rollo-Koster, Kim Washor

Guests: Ryan Carrillo, Jayne Pelletier, Cindy Mace, Chris McMahan, Vern Wyman

1. Announcements  
   ➢ New President of University of Rhode Island Foundation, Elizabeth “Lil” Breul O’Rourke, who played a key role in a $1B campaign  
   ➢ Probably will ask for a University of Rhode Island Foundation report for next meeting  
   ➢ New Dean of Nursing, Dr. Barbara Wolfe, Associate Dean of Nursing for Research at Boston College

2. Approval of February 4, 2016 Minutes  
   ➢ Approved

3. CIP Overview  
   ➢ Overview of last year’s submission to the state  
   ➢ Utility Infrastructure project on hold due to Governor recommending RIHEBC (RICAP was requested); needed long term, continue patchwork with Asset Protection; do have new substation in process  
   ➢ Asset Protection Committee works biweekly to reassess based on Governor’s recommendation  
   ➢ Horn renovation: we are reconsidering as review GSO master plan, Governor has not recommended this project  
   ➢ Athletic and Recreation advanced planning: Governor approved as requested  
   ➢ NBC Hazmat: we would submit back to the state for RICAP  
   ➢ Fraternity Circle: Privately funded, state approved; fraternity association with URIF, bond with debt paid for by fee from fraternities  
   ➢ Edwards Hall: Governor changed from RICAP to RIHEBC  
   ➢ Repaving, hardscape, landscape: may redistribute this project to FY2019  
     - SBPC had questions and needed more information which is the reason they rated it lower  
     - Looking to re-solicit for new vendor for transportation plan  
   ➢ Shepards Building – recommended approval of $4.8M  
     - Would the 195 plan for public/private partnership (100,000 sq. ft.) affect this project? Could be set up like the RINEC; keep hearing about areas in Shepards that could be in the 195 project  
     - Regardless of occupant, the work is necessary
- Is a Department of Administration building
- We have the highest interest
- Original agreement states that we were the tenant
- SBPC April 23, 2015 Minutes (copy attached–see yellow highlights) indicated that if a request was made for Shepards facility, URI Business Services needed to work with the Department of Administration (DOA) with the goal of having DOA request 50% and URI request 50% vs URI requesting 100% of the needed capital funding. This is consistent with the current facilities support of Shepards that is split between URI and DOA.
  - Fine Arts Center - $3.5M in RICAP and $68M in GO Bonds, Governor’s budget recommends it in November 2018 (no guarantee), concern given the condition of the building
  - Have met with the college and had internal meetings within Business Services to address the maintenance for at least two years
  - Revenue projections at May revenue conference could change some projects
  - Governor’s recommendation came out after the Brookings Report and some recommendations relate to the report’s findings
  - Appears Governor wanted to keep the new debt at a maximum of ~$200M for the state
  - RI debt is not a big fraction of average income but is #5 of all the states
  - Need to think about a Plan B for Fine Arts
  - Escalation would make the project $78M in FY18
  - College of Engineering, Phase II at $25.5M recommended for GO
  - Ocean Engineering at GSO, state recommended $9M in University and $9M in private for Ocean Engineering
  - Historic quad buildings renovation $105M at GO; recommend FY20 at $60M; 6 major buildings including Roosevelt and Quinn; must take buildings off line to renovate
  - Have several high priority projects not funded
  - Would like to discuss what the Council’s approach should be relative to the CIP
  - Some projects were not addressed in the budget
  - Two years ago SBPC suggested a separate list for projects that are in the low/low category; and if those projects came back, it would be as an entirely new project
  - Low projects have been removed from the CIP
  - We have reacted annually; senior team is looking for SBPC recommendations
  - Project first comes to Capital Planning Office – due diligence before it would go on to the CIP; GO bond projects like to get on the CIP asap to give the state a heads up; how to best work with SBPC to inform future projects for the CIP; not a methodical approach
  - Process described: In early January notice to senior leadership requesting project submissions for upcoming submission; requestor supposed to work through their administrative structure; prior to review by SBPC and senior leadership; only way on the list is that the division head endorses it; Capital Planning works with the division head to prioritize; within the form there are criteria we ask each requestor to address; (copy attached) could create a smaller subcommittee in advance of the SBPC meeting; could use the same kind of committee/team process we use for the new initiatives; possibly one subcommittee or maybe the fall work of the committee; projects could be separated by “category” (e.g. new building vs. maintenance)
  - Suggest smaller committee that meets early in the fall and releases a request for proposals giving what the priorities are for the campus; or direct through the VP’s and have them generate requests from their areas; Chair suggested Ryan and a small committee of SBPC and craft a campus-wide process that would involve SBPC, solicitation, input; the following individuals will meet: Mary Jo, Wendy, Ann and Ryan
  - School newspaper on athletic fields; in the storm water management project; with this new push, pulled out as a stand-alone; anytime we tinker with student fees, we are affecting cost of attendance and student aid; he proposed to the President and spoke with the SAC and the
sports council and took it to student senate; they won’t entertain it this year, will go to referendum; need capacity to address emergent issues; URI has a process and this appears to have been outside of the process
➢ Where do we draw the line between new building and other like major updates/maintenance; need separate tracks
➢ Priority and placement of CIP: we are responsible for bringing conditions of assets to attention of SEPC
➢ Projects that have a master plan/advanced planning is beneficial; the unit that is submitting should have to make a contribution

4. Update on Performance Funding
➢ Meetings with the Commissioner’s staff and Dennis Jones. Met earlier with Dennis Jones; progress being made in metrics; funding formula side relates back to the cost of the program; will hear about metrics at the next meeting with the Commissioner, formula rationale for average credit hour for all three schools; NCHEMS is all about teaching and does not support research; outreach, public service, land and sea grant, graduate education, research not addressed. Can’t point to actual improvement from NCHEMS. Other states have added supplements for areas like Research, Athletics, etc. State already declines to meet its land and sea grant match.
➢ Everyone wants formulas to work; think about it practically and ethically and if can’t pass the test, that is a problem; big issue is, do they want it to come out to what we get now in: State Appropriations and say, it’s working; other issue is credit hour cost for the system; NCHEMS says if you start with your own data, it has inherent issues; we suggested comparisons to other research comparable institutions.

5. Update on Streamlining
➢ Need to ensure that the streamlining portion of the Academic Plan gets attention
➢ Faculty Senate leader, another faculty, a representative of this group, Ellen, Gerry, Christina - stay at a high level and think about better/alternative ways of organizing service delivery on campus; develop a thoughtful charge and create 3-4 small task forces for specific areas and ensure that end users are involved
➢ Can be the clearinghouse to be an intersection for areas
➢ Streamlining issues where different divisions would have to work together
➢ Some old office structures may need to be reviewed
➢ Always a temptation to “fix the complaint” but don’t fix the entire problem
➢ Need a substantive and all inclusive discussion
➢ Have created work arounds; need to elevate the importance of service
➢ May need a consultant at the appropriate time; need to identify the issues first

6. Other

Reminder: FY2018 (July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018) Divisional Requests
➢ New Funding Request Proposals
➢ Due to Budget & Financial Planning Office March 25, 2016
➢ Related link to four documents:
   http://web.uri.edu/sbpc/supporting-documents/

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 am

Next meeting March 10, 9:00 - 10:30 am, Ballentine Hall
Minutes by Linda Barrett and Lisa Fiorio
Budget & Financial Planning Office
The University of Rhode Island  
Strategic Budget and Planning Council  
April 23, 2015  
10:00 am – 11:30 am  
Thomson Board Room, Ballentine Hall  

Members in Attendance:  
Don DeHayes (Chair), Christina L. Valentino (Vice Chair), Linda Barrett, Faye Boudreaux-Bartels, Sharon Bell, Wendy Bucci, Lori Ciccomascalo, Steven D’Hondt, Tom Dougan, John Kirby, Trish Morokoff, Ann Morrissey, Bahram Nassershariif, Ellen Reynolds, Gerry Sonnenfeld, Devon Swanson, Naomi Thompson, Kim Washor  

Members Absent: Rachel DiCioccio, Ken Kermes, Joseph Maynard, Thorr Bjorn,  

See the complete list of member information at the Strategic Budget and Planning Council website at:  
http://www.uri.edu/budget/sbpc.html  

1) Chair distributed last year’s results of Council’s CIP recommendation to the President for members to use as they review this year’s projects.  

2) CIP Review (Ryan Carrillo)  
   a) Five categories that will be used by members as they rate projects, which is the same as last year.  
   b) Biological Resources Lab (Vivarium) – replace all rodent vivarium on campus; all are sub-par; to provide new animal space that will meet accreditation. Identified 6600 sq. ft.; 3300 each in CBLS and Pharmacy. Working with a team on a 1,000 sq. ft. project. We may need all or some of the space. $8.7M relates to the 6600 sq. ft. Facilities are very outdated; need to update to be competitive.  
      a. Research funding affiliated with the facility? In neuroscience institute, everyone who will be affiliated will need this facility; recent recruiting of faculty who will use it; probably $10M per VP Sonnenfeld and could include the $15M from the Ryan gift; will enable us to yield more grants from corporate. (Gerry responded by email on April 24th with the following clarification: The numbers were my best estimate of the revenue that would involve rodent related studies after we hire the 55 new faculty. I estimated that 10 of the new faculty would be extensive animal researchers, which is a strong possibility. No award will have its entire amount used for rodent work but the study could not be completed without it. So the Ryan gift of $15M requires rodent studies in order to develop the neuroscience center. No matter how much is used, the $15M would not be here without rodent work. No matter how much they actually spend, we would not have the whole gift without rodent studies. The 10s of millions was my estimate of where we will be when the facility is completed with existing faculty, new faculty recruited for the neurosciences center, and other new faculty. It includes programs such as the current and future INBRE program from NIH, which is multi million and multi-year. URI is an outlier without accreditation. This would have to become a cost center per the Chair. Cost center will not carry the debt; ~$700K annually.)  
      b. No one spoke with John Kirby about the Vivarium and John has concerns about it being on first floor of CBLS.  
   c) Utility Infrastructure Ph 1 -$6.5M (Ph 2 is $18M) – cover major steam, sewer, electrical, under campus. It could be included in a GO Bond project; however, we just received $125M and $80M
is in future for Fine Arts. In FY18, $39M Ph 3 for Ocean Engineering and $125M for historic quad. In next two submissions for GO Bonds, URI is requesting significant amounts.

a. Seems like steam tunnel digging annually. Is it possible for a longer term planning? This is a dedicated funding source so that long term planning can occur. Piecemeal due to using Asset Protection funding each year. There has not been a formal analysis of annual maintenance. At the scale of $6.5M for Ph1 and $18M for Ph2, we are doing long term improvements.

b. PH 1 and 2 can stand alone. PH1 reflects the critical areas. We would see benefits even if PH2 did not occur for years.

d) Horn Building – scientific lab building; will be doing a master plan for Bay Campus in FY16 and determine if will be rebuilt or renovated. GO Bond project for GSO campus anticipated after master plan is completed. Relationship of this to the master plan and the A&E of Horn. In FY13 awarded $2.5M of grant revenue related to Horn Building.

e) Storm Water Management Project – comprehensive look at deficient areas on campus; trying to retain water at source; $6.3M with $2.8M from auxiliary and remainder from RICAP. Intention is seven (7) key places of known issues. Portion of work that is around the football stadium; upon completion it would provide synthetic turf in the field; could use the field and capacity under it for water storage.

f) Public Safety Building – in 3 locations, 44 Lower College Rd, police station on Briar Lane and 177 Plains Road near the Ryan Center; study in 2012 with outside consultant; $6.5M RICAP request brings all three sites together;

a. This received a low priority last year and there was a recommendation to come up with an alternative to building a new building; we are setting up an internal competition for RICAP $; need alternative model; should not keep submitting Plan A; a lot of work went into this for location given the type of building and the emergency services. Bahram fully supports reallocation of another space; sends wrong message to build a new building for a police force.

b. Christina would like to re-visit the history and logic. Should be willing to look at it. Would like to re-visit based on comments.

c. Funding for Briar Lane location historical info should be reviewed. Is there another model?

d. Need to leave it on here.

g) Athletics & Recreation Facilities – Advanced Planning – rebuilding of grandstand and press box; pool and Mackal. $250K from university funds for consultant in athletic facilities for small master plan.

a. When we did the A&E for Engineering and for bay campus and Horn; both Engineering and GSO co-shared the advanced planning. Should continue with this model; Athletics has potential to bring other funding sources to the table; suggest that this be the model

b. A portion is recreation which is separate from Athletics

h) NBC Hazmat Storage – storage of hazardous waste for pick up. Current is nearing end of life; pursuing RICAP funding; many universities have a surcharge for purchase of chemicals and cost would go towards funding; it is not all from chemicals; but, for maintenance, etc. surcharge should be for purchase of hazardous materials

a. Was this cited in EPA inspection? Results of last week visit not available.

b. Could be a safety issue.

i) Hope Commons Expansion – NE corner would bump out seating area; would provide additional areas and better service for catering events. Second space front side on Butterfield Rd; provide options until about 3:00am and could do this without opening the larger facility.
a. How relate to Butterfield expansion? Currently have RFP out for 500 bed apartment hall which generates some dining usage; part driven by additional services; investment in facilities that students use for many hours.

FY2018

j) Facilities Service Sector Upgrade (w/o L&G/Auto) - Ph1 ($10.3M) was removed from CIP and Ph2 was maintained on CIP $9.7M; could look to doing L&G first; represents some of the larger facility. Recycle or waste management infrastructure; storage for HRL and general warehouse; mail services; printing services; upgrade of spaces within Sherman Building; steam electrical, plumbing; some is new building and some upgrades to existing building
   a. Some are old metal buildings; some are new like recycling
   b. A brief description of each project was provided to Council members
   c. Ryan will include a copy of a master plan where appropriate in future years

k) Fraternity Circle – Ph 1 approved RIHEBC in FY2016 budget. This second phase of $2.9M would be paid for by fraternity association; is all amenities after infrastructure (e.g. basketball courts).
   a. Do not have a signed commitment from fraternities
   b. Local fraternities/sororities are working with their alumni boards, etc.
   c. If association fees ok but not sure URIF can accept donations
   d. Timeline to complete phase 1 – could be mid FY18; would overlap design in ph2 with construction completion of ph1.

l) Edwards Hall Renovation ($3.8M) RICAP – did life safety improvements and historic renovations; infrastructure utility repairs, elevator, roof repairs, A/C, new windows, HVAC system. Will any of this undue recent renovation? Some will e.g. lobby to accommodate elevator; have had issues with mold growth and will help to preserve it.
   a. Could any theatre productions find a home in Edwards? – does not have the acoustics nor the technical aspects for theatre; probably not in ongoing

m) Repaving, hardscape and landscape – roadways, walkways; many areas need rebuilding.
   a. Parking does provide funds for renovation of parking lots; no co-share for this
   b. If add this to bond we have now will not finish – need it constantly with the weather we have, always need rehab
   c. $34M bond received five years ago; helped us to complete features of the north district; have approached state; will reconstruct Flagg Rd and we are in the queue with other municipals; Upper College Rd does not qualify for state highway $”
   d. Description is lacking; as you fix should think about how make better; speeding and traffic issue on Upper College Rd; traffic patterns on campus, particularly at end of day; while we think of the $ for repairing
   e. Parking and transportation master plan in process to look at better methods of transportation; pending these results will have more targeted projects
   f. Deferred maintenance of campus is $540M; how much of this request is maintenance vs new?
   g. Combination of investments in replacements, improvements showed a steady state of our assets for ten years
   h. Debt service is $800K annually from Parking Services which would include parking charges to faculty and staff; about 80% of unrestricted is from students; we compete with ourselves for new funding generated from tuition

n) Shepard Building Improvements -
   a. $4.7M RICAP – building owned by DOA; it is in our CIP because if we don’t they won’t – this project is for roofs, infrastructure; restroom improvements, elevator improvements; façade including safety issues
b. It was noted that we do not have an official document requesting state to request 50%.

c. Should we wait until school of education is finalized? Not related to curriculum.

d. It is an approved project in Governor's budget.

e. Are more requests likely? Yes as we do more evaluation of the façade.

f. Qualitative statements without backup data; Lori said more data is becoming available.

| g. Next year, Ryan hoping to provide more data |
| h. State in our proposal that we are requesting 50% and state that DOA is 50% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>o) Utilities Infrastructure</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cmpletion of known deficiencies, $18M RHEBC, annual debt service $1.5M annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Is there a Ph3 and Ph4 in future? No consistent funding source to meet infrastructure needs to support the plant. With proper planning should not see this surge of need at this level. Water tower $2M to repaint; must be done to maintain integrity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Difference between Ph1 and 2? Description appears identical. Ph1 address the most urgent needs; dealing with overall system; level of urgency is the difference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Can we really spend all Ph1 in FY17 and go to Ph2 in FY18. If knew $ were forthcoming could plan for economies of scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Council to complete their rating forms; only members in attendance will complete the forms; forms to be sent to Linda Barrett for compilation by noon on Friday, April 24th.

4) Meeting adjourned at 11:40am.

Minutes submitted by:
Linda Barrett, Budget & Financial Planning Office
CIP Project Proposal Form
FY 2018-2022

Project Name: 

Applicant's Name: 

Department/Division: 

Total Project Cost: 

Vice Pres. Signature / Endorsement of Project 

Brief Description of Project Scope:

Project Justification. Please answer the following questions with a brief description if the answer is "Yes".

1. Does the space provide for new or expanding programs? 

   ☐ Yes  ☐ No
CIP Project Proposal Form

2. Does the project note the strategic relationship to the President’s transformational goals, the academic plan, and/or the University mission?  
   ○ Yes  ○ No

3. Does the project facilitate new and important research activities, attract external funds, or generate sustainable funding support?  
   ○ Yes  ○ No
CIP Project Proposal Form

4. Does the project facilitate an increase in the number of people served or activities undertaken by the program?  
   ○ Yes  ○ No

5. Does the project enhance an existing program by improving the teaching/research/service environment (allow for new technology, etc.)?  
   ○ Yes  ○ No

All CIP Project Proposals must be submitted via e-mail by February 26, 2016 to rcarrillo@uri.edu.

Attend the information session on Monday, February 15, 2015 at 10 am in 210 Flagg Road, room 207, or contact Ryan Carrillo at 874-9525 by February 18, 2016 for assistance defining the project scope and estimating a budget.