

University Facility Fee Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, September 29th, 2016

303 GSB

Members Present:	Clayton King	Chair
	Tristian Syron	Vice-Chair
	Rachel Largay	Warner College of Natural Resources
	Amanda Evans	CVMBS
	Jeff Cook	Graduate College
	Anthony Taylor	College of Liberal Arts
	Kalyn Blach	College of Agriculture
Members at Large:	Kiri Michell	College of Health & Human Sciences
	Daniela Pineda Soraca	ASCSU
Associate Members Present:	Nick Bohn	ASCSU
	Alex	CVMBS
Other Members Present:	Becca Wren	Staff Support
	Tom Satterly	Advisor
	Kristi Buffington	Facilities Management
	Tamla Blunt	Ex-Officio Member
	Savanna Bunnell	Staff Support
Guests:	Megan Miller	Facilities Management
	Ginger Wright	Facilities Management
	Lynn Johnson	Vice President for University Operations
	Thom Hadley	CVMBS
	Bob Kaempfe	CVMBS

1. Voting Process Review

- a. Clayton reviewed the basic voting processes with the board.
- b. UFFAB utilizes Robert's Rules of Order to help facilitate efficient discussion. The rules loosely govern conversation but are used more strictly during voting processes.
- c. **How to make a formal motion-**
 - i. Address the chair and the board by saying "I move to....."
 - ii. The motion needs to be seconded
 - (1) The chair is responsible for calling for a second. "Is this motion seconded?"
 - iii. The member who made the motion has the floor to begin debate and discussion.
 - iv. Once the discussion has dwindled, it is the Chair's responsibility for move to a vote, by asking "Is there any objection to taking a vote?"
 - v. If there is no objection, the meeting moves into a vote.
- d. **How to make an amendment -**
 - i. After a formal motion has been presented, a board member can move to amend the previous motion.
 - ii. The amendment has to be seconded.

- iii. Once seconded, the member who proposed the amendment has to floor to being debate and discussion.
- iv. The board then votes to accept or reject the amendment.
- v. The board can only go as deep as two amendments on a single motion.

e. How to vote

- i. For clarity, the Chair repeats the motion currently on the table.
- ii. UFFAB's voting is based on majority.
- iii. Chair calls for a vote, "All in favor of..." and "All opposed..."
- iv. Chair and clerk both count hands, which are recorded in the minutes.
- v. If a vote is tied, the motion fails.
- vi. The Chair can vote in the occasion of a tie so long as they did not vote in the original vote.

2. Warner College of Natural Resources Design Discussion – Presented by Megan Miller

- a. In 2014, UFFAB approved funding for a 250-seat auditorium addition to the north side of the WCNR building for \$2.5 million.
- b. In February of 2016, the project was relocated to the south side of the building for two reasons:
 - i. The north side renovation would include extensive utilities relocation.
 - ii. The college's desire to have their extension be more visible from the spine of campus.
- c. The updated program includes one flipped general assignment classroom that seats 120 students, a number of study areas, a Wi-Fi lounge, and a donor funded student success center.
- d. The new design is about 9,700 square feet, compared to 8,000 of the first program design.
- e. The Classroom Review Board approved the updated plan in September of 2016.

Questions:

- f. How has this affected the amount of students served per dollar spent?
 - i. The updated plan actually serves more students, so the cost per student has decreased.
- g. When is this projected scheduled to be completed?
 - ii. Fall of 2018.
- h. Does the classroom fits less students than the original program plan?
 - iii. Yes, but overall, the new program plan serves more students in more flexibly ways, such as the study spaces and flipped classroom space.
- i. What is the total program budget?
 - iv. \$21.5 million.
- j. What are the next steps for this project?
 - v. Next, the design will be finalized and construction will being in February/March.

3. Cash Flow Sheet Review – Ginger Wright

- a. Ginger Wright, Facilities Management Asian Director of Finance, reviewed and explained the cash flow spreadsheet to the Board.
- b. The facility fee, first implemented in 2006, has collected \$120 million dollars in student fees. That has translated to about \$231 million dollars, as the Board has chosen to fund a number of bonded projects.
- c. Projections are based on student enrollment, which is conservatively estimated.
- d. Lynn Johnson has suggested a separation between cash and bonded projects. At least \$2 dollars of the \$20.75 is committed to cash funded projects. The Board can change this distribution if they would like.

4. Warner College of Natural Resources Funding Discussion

- a. The Board has the opportunity to save about \$800,000 in interest if they choose to pay off the total \$2.5 million cost of the WCNR project. The project cost could be paid off in cash now and save the interest accumulation.
 - i. Paying the project cost now, as opposed to paying it off over the next twenty years is the recommendation of Tom Satterly, Ginger Wright, and Lynn Johnson.
- b. If the Board chooses not to pay the balance in cash now, interest will likely be at least 3.5% over the next 20 years.
- c. Paying off this \$2.5 million project cost from the cash side of the facility fee will not impact the amount of cash available for this year's funding cycle.

5. Health Education Outreach Center Funding Request

- a. The AZ addition project that UFFAB has seen in the past is now called the Health Education Outreach Center.
- b. The state of Colorado, in partnership with the National Western Stock Show, has committed \$50 million dollars to the University to be used for three projects, including \$22.3 million dollars specifically for the Health Education Outreach Center.
- c. UFFAB has committed \$1 million dollars to the project. Originally, the money was dedicated to the construction of the project, to be released at the time of construction.
 - i. The College came to the Board in 2015 to ask for an extension of the timeline to use the funding. The extension was granted until December of 2018.
- d. Now, the College is asking UFFAB to release the funds to be used for the design of the project.
- e. While the funding from the state is guaranteed to the project through state legislation, it must go through a number of bureaucratic agencies and boards in order to be approved. The process is lengthy and complicated, and funds will therefore most likely not be released until spring of 2017.
- f. If UFFAB's funds are not released until 2017 (when the state's funds are available), the project will not be completed until 2019.
- g. If UFFAB releases the funds now, the project can begin the designing process now, rather than in 2017. This would speed up the timeline of the program, which is important because this program is highly central to the College in uncapping majors and expanding the degree program. Additionally, construction costs increase significantly over time.
- h. Lynn Johnson spoke to the Board about the process that happens in the state in order to release the funds to the university. The process includes being placed on prioritized lists.
- i. The team working on the project has worked careful to make sure all requirements are met and they are confident the program plans will be fully approved. Nevertheless, the process is still anticipated to take time.

Questions -

- j. Do you expect any contention in the legislation?
 - i. No, the state has passed the bill committing the \$50 million dollars to the University.
- k. Could docketed projects surpass this building to claim this funding?
 - i. No. This money is specifically allotted to the project through statute, so it is not competing with other projects.
- l. Is the \$1 million for UFFAB enough to begin the design process?
 - i. Yes.
- m. How delayed would the project become if UFFAB does not release the funds now?
 - i. 8-12 months.
- n. What happens if UFFAB releases the funding now and the \$22.3 million falls through?

- i. The funds cannot go anywhere else, they are committed to this project through legislation. The \$22.3 million will not fall through.
- ii. Tom Satterly explained that because of this specific funding mechanism, there is relatively low risk in investing in the design work before the remaining funds are available.

6. Voting on all Items

- a. Health Education Outreach Center Funding:
 - i. Jeff Cook moved to approve releasing the funds now and allowing the funds to be used for design work.
 - ii. Kalyn seconded.
 - iii. All those in favor: 8
 - iv. All opposed: 0
 - v. Abstentions: 2
 - vi. Motion passed.

- b. Warner College of Natural Resources Funding:
 - i. Jeff Cook moved to pay the project cost of \$2.5 million out of cash instead of bonding.
 - ii. Anthony seconded.
 - iii. Clayton mentioned it would save money in long run and the Board could discuss maybe decreasing fees in the future.
 - iv. All those in favor: 10
 - v. All opposed: 0
 - vi. Abstentions: 0
 - vii. Motion passed.

- c. Warner College of Natural Resources Design
 - i. Anthony moved to approve the change in design of the Warner College of Natural Resources building.
 - ii. Kalyn second.
 - iii. All those in favor: 10
 - iv. All those opposed: 0
 - v. Abstentions: 0
 - vi. Motion passed.

Next Meeting: October 13th, 5:00-6:00 pm in 303 GSB