The University of Rhode Island  
Strategic Budget and Planning Council  
April 24, 2012  
10:00 am – 12:00 pm  
Thomson Board Room, Ballentine Hall

Members in Attendance:  
Chair Don DeHayes, Vice Chair Bob Weygand, Peter Alfonso, Abu Bakr, Faye Boudreaux Bartels, Winnie Brownell, Ray Wright, Nancy Eaton, Cheryl Foster, Jeff Johnson, Patricia Morokoff, Stephanie Segal, Linda Barrett, Ann Morrissey, Steve D’Hondt, Thorr Bjorn

Members Absent:  
Bob Beagle, Ken Kermes, Scott Martin, Trish Casey, Tom Dougan, Ron Jordan, Michael Smith

See the complete list of member information at the Strategic Budget and Planning Council website at http://www.uri.edu/budget/sbpc/Membership%201-11.pdf

Meeting Minutes  
1. Meeting was called to order at 10:07 am.

Announcements  
None

Agenda Items

1) Item #2 on the agenda- Presentation of Capital Improvement Plan
   i) Vern Wyman provided an overview (PowerPoint) of the different funding streams and types of building projects related to those funds.
   ii) Tom Frisbee Fulton and Ryan Carrillo presented the Council with a the new CIP request template and the principles for evaluating projects as they relate to the Academic plan, sustainability and the Campus Master Plan, and benefits to the University, and resource implications.
   iii) Chair: With the approval of a new building, the University should assume a $9-$10 per GSF annual operating cost once the building is operative.
   iv) Discussion on the naming opportunity associated with the LGBTQ Center for potential donor. Chair mentioned that there were earlier conversations related to a specific donor. Vice Chair indicated that they have not pursued this opportunity.
   v) Fogarty Hall is currently slated as an FY15 priority because it is believed the funding for the project will not be available until that time.
   vi) Discussion on why the University is responsible for renovations to the Shepards building despite not actually owning the building. As tenants of the building, the University has taken over asset protection for the building.

2) Discussion and Deliberation by SBPC members
   i) Discussion on why Tyler building renovation would increase operating costs for the building. URI study shows a renovated building has 20% higher operating costs than
an un-renovated building. Tyler, specifically, will be adding air conditioning to two floors of the building which is main reason for the increase in operating budget.

ii) If a project changes funding; i.e. from RICAP to RIHEBC, debt service becomes the responsibility of the unrestricted budget.

iii) Vice Chair: we should be doing the advance planning for the use of Fogarty Hall right now. There are a number of departments looking to move into Fogarty.

iv) Vice Chair: Having enough asset protection funds built into Division of Administration budget to allow the University to make major repairs and upkeep of building would be ideal; unfortunately we do not have that. By dipping into Capital funds for asset protection projects, we delay other projects.

v) Discussion on specific sources (i.e. foundations) which the University could apply to for financing of capital projects and classroom technology projects.

vi) Vice Chair: We need to be as aggressive seeking sources of private funding as we have been with getting GO bonds.

vii) Chair: Revenue potential of potential occupants of a building should be considered when making decisions about project investments relative to their occupants. Perhaps that should be its own criterion, a fifth to add to the list of Capital projects evaluation.

viii) A consensus emerged that it is critical to find the funding for the advanced planning of Fogarty, so that the building is not sitting vacant for a long period of time.

ix) Discussion ensued about the viability of the council ranking each capital improvement request individually. An alternative role for the council in this process could be to develop a set of priorities and values and relay them to the capital improvements team.

x) Chair suggested placing new space low on the priority list because of future operating cost implications. Many universities have put a moratorium on new buildings.

xi) Vice Chair: We can take all input from today's deliberations on capital planning and create a summary form. We can send that form out to all committee members. The form can be reviewed by all committee members, revised as necessary, and then sent to President and his team.

xii) Consensus: Looking into the future use of the Fogarty-Morrill complex is critical and the future of the vivarium is related to that. Looking at alternative sources of funding for these projects is important.

xiii) The Fogarty-Morrill-Pastore Complex project will be moved up in priority within the CIP to reflect the deliberations of the council.

xiv) The Vice Chair proposes that next year, the SBPC's evaluation of Capital Improvements begin five months sooner.

xv) One final note on why the vivarium is such a potentially expensive project: The vivarium requires 100% redundancy for all HVAC systems. Also, very expensive safety features are required.

xvi) Meeting adjourned.
Next Meeting

May 15, 2012 9:00am - 12:00pm – Thomson Boardroom, Ballentine Hall

Minutes by: John Olerio, Budget & Financial Planning Office