

**Meeting Minutes**  
**University Space Committee**  
**University of Central Florida**  
**February 4, 2021**

The following Committee members attended the teleconference meeting: Brian Boyd, Daniel Gross, Elizabeth Hamilton, Susan Hutson, Shelley King, Bill Martin, Don Merritt, Christy Miranda, Charles Reilly, Duane Siemen and Elizabeth Zuehlke.

Karen Cobbs, Mike Kilbride, David Hansen and Griff Parks did not attend.

Guest(s): Puja Mandolfo, Michael Scruggs, Vicky Sharp and Gina Seabrook

**Agenda Item 1 – Review December Meeting Minutes**

The December meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

**Agenda Item 2 – Educational Plant Survey Needs Assessment**

Christy Miranda mentioned that the Board of Governors (BOG) had changed the Educational Plant Survey (EPS) Needs Assessment (NA) process from previous survey years. The changes include a reduction in the number of PECO projects that can be submitted to five; unlimited submissions for remodeling, utility infrastructure and renovation projects that are going to use carry forward funds; and any projects that haven't received a survey recommendation prior to July 1<sup>st</sup> will be ineligible for consideration in the PECO Scoring Matrix. The EPS has to be in tandem with the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) List which also has to be submitted by July 1<sup>st</sup>. The UCF EPS Report is slated to be submitted to the UCF Board of Trustees at the April 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting and to the BOG at the June 26<sup>th</sup> meeting

Bill Martin asked about the need for survey approval for infrastructure and remodeling projects below the threshold of \$10 million (M). Christy Miranda stated that in the 2021-2026 EPS Recommendation Letter, there will be a general requirements section that will provide a standard recommendation approving the use of carry forward funds to complete all remodeling or infrastructure projects that do not exceed the statutory threshold. There is also a standard recommendation approving the use of carry forward funds to complete renovation projects under the \$5 M threshold. Bill Martin expressed that Facilities Planning and Construction (FPC) has delayed minor projects to adhere to the restrictive language in Senate Bill 190. Christy Miranda mentioned that the BOG is aware of the issue and created the general requirements language to provide the universities more flexibility.

Christy Miranda notified the committee that the university's space deficit (approximately \$3.1 M NASF) was large enough to prevent hitting 100% in any of our space categories even if all five PECO projects were listed in the Form B. In spite of the BOG allowing five PECO projects for survey approval, only two projects may be submitted for the PECO Scoring Matrix. Once a project has been listed as the university's top two priority projects, it cannot be removed without justification until fully funded with PECO funds. Removal is allowed if the university plans to complete the project with a portion of PECO and carry forward funds or private donations. Christy Miranda stated that FPC will need to supply a list of the PECO and carry forward projects under consideration, as well as information on the remodeling projects to show how the square footage will be redistributed among the space categories after the projects are complete. Charles Reilly mentioned that Janet Owen from Government Relations had

suggested emphasizing research laboratory projects based on the legislature's feedback. Duane Siemen clarified that the Learning Laboratory (LL) was listed ahead of the Research II project since it is intended to replace the teaching labs in Chemistry that are reaching their end of life. Chuck Reilly stated that it will be helpful to mention that research will be supported by the construction of the LL and the teaching labs are STEM labs that support overpopulated majors. Bill Martin questioned if the legislature's preference for research changes the paradigm of what projects UCF selects as our number one priority. Duane Siemen stated that Facilities and Safety has identified buildings that could be converted into research buildings fairly quickly with a renovation but will require units to release space. Charles Reilly stated that if we don't receive any funding for the LL in a year or two, we may want to alter the sequence of the CIP list.

Christy Miranda sent a link to FPC with all of the previous presentations that were done in 2015 EPS to review and update. Since none of the projects were funded, there should be minimal updates to the PowerPoint presentations. The five PECO project presentations will be longer and include more detailed information than the carry forward projects. Any athletic, CITF, medical, or public private partnership projects may be included for informational purposes only. Susan Hutson proposed that the Provost should present the LL since he was involved in the creation of the summary of required spaces in 2018. Brian Boyd volunteered to assist with collecting data and nominated Teresa Dorman, Associate Dean from the College of Sciences, to speak on the backlog of student registration. Christy Miranda stated that she would find a day that all of the presenters would be available to present before notifying the BOG of the NA date. Bill Martin suggested scheduling a follow-up meeting to go over the presentations. The NA audience will include two representatives from the BOG Finance and Facilities division, and representatives from other institutions in the SUS (USF, UNF and FAMU). Bill Martin suggested inviting Kevin Prichard, Director of the BOG Finance and Facilities department. Christy Miranda stated that historically after the EPS, there has been a better chance of projects getting funded because the projects presented are more front of mind for the BOG so if the legislatives were to inquire about a project, then the BOG will be able to provide more detail.

### **Agenda Item 3 – Trailer 541 Alternate Locations Update**

Christy Miranda reached out to James Wilkening, Director of the Recreation and Wellness Center (RWC), to discuss options for relocating the courses in Trailer 541 to their facilities. Representatives from the College of Arts and Humanities (CAH) have been shown spaces in Ferrell Commons - E (FC-E) and FC-H, as well as, meeting rooms in Nike Building 101 and 102. FC-E is used primarily for student sports organizations and pre-pandemic were scheduled from 10:00 in the morning to 10:00 at night, seven days a week. RWC did offer a two hour window from 8:00-10:00 in the morning prior to the first student organization's practice. In its current layout, FC-H isn't useable for CAH, but RWC did offer up additional locations, such as the MAC Gym in the RWC and a group exercise room over in the Knights Plaza. We notified CAH about the additional options and they did not believe that they would be able to make it work with their current scheduling. However, Brian Boyd has reviewed their Fall 2021 schedule and believes that they will be able to find space for them to teach in other general-purpose classrooms without changing the meeting patterns. There are still concerns over the piano noise disrupting other classes, but in terms of room size it won't be an issue. Vicky Sharp inquired into the types of courses that would be using the space. Brian Boyd clarified that the majority of the courses are acting classes, but occasionally there are play rehearsals that require musical accompaniment. There has been communication between CAH and FPC where the College has requested that all planning for the

removal of Trailer 541 be halted until a future home for the courses can be identified. CAH has secured space in the Arena and Student Union through Spring 2021. The RWC is only willing to extend the use of its facilities for a year, which will give the committee additional time to find a permanent location by 2022.

#### **Agenda Item 4 – Conex Cove Update**

Bill Martin stated that Facilities has applied for a certificate of completion and expects to receive approval by the following week. The access control on the fencing was submitted under a separate permit, but is expected to be approved.

#### **Agenda Item 5 – PECO Scoring Matrix Criteria**

Bill Martin presented the PECO Scoring Matrix that looks at six criteria for scoring PECO projects on the CIP List. This scoring matrix is a part of the Florida Statutes and the BOG has simplified it into a scoring system. There are 100 available points, but all of the criteria don't apply to every project; the most a project can score is around 50 points. The scoring criteria includes the following: Projects with prior legislative funding, Maintenance and Infrastructure, Space Needs Met, University Priority, Renovation and Replacement, and Available Funds for New Construction. Prior legislative funding awards points for projects that have previously received state funding in order to finish out the project. UCF hasn't received any funding, so we are not eligible for these points. On the first criteria, the points awarded to projects start at 20, decreasing in points by a factor of 2. For example, the University of Florida Data Center had previously received funding, so they were awarded more points (20) to complete the project; Florida State University received points (18) to complete an interdisciplinary facility, and so on. The second criteria is Maintenance and Infrastructure and it has the same ranking principle. Renovation projects receive points for the second criteria, but new construction projects are ineligible. Space Needs Met is the third criteria that looks at the project square footage that will be added to the campus versus the overall campus size. Initially, this criterion would seem to benefit UCF because of our large space deficit, but it's actually the inverse. Since we are so underbuilt, a 100,000 square foot (sq. ft.) building is going to have less impact on our space need met percentage compared to a 100,000 sq. ft. on a smaller university. The university is competing against the other SUS projects and the scoring awarded is ranked sequentially as 25, 23, 21, etc. The University Priority criteria awards 5 points for each university's number one project and 3 points for their second priority, but this isn't a differentiator since all of the SUS projects gets the same number of points per project. The Renovation and Replacement criteria awards points from 15-0 with the most cost effective projects scoring higher, which equates to a smaller cost per sq. ft. The last criteria is Available Funds for New Construction and if a university contributes 2, 4 or 6 percent of the total building costs, the university will be awarded 2, 4, or 6 points for that project. Points are also awarded to projects that are consistent with the Board initiative (+2), legislative intent (+2), preserving safety (+2) and funding from private sources. If the university can collect 25% of the total buildings costs from donations, a project can accumulate an additional 12 points.

Referencing the 2019 BOG scoring list, none of the submitted SUS projects had 25% of their funding from private sources, resulting in 0 points across the board. In the 2020 CIP list, UCF's top priority project (LL) ranked 17<sup>th</sup> overall. The University of South Florida (USF) submitted a project comparable to UCF with no previous legislative funding. In the Space Needs Met criteria, USF received 13 points, UCF got 11 points. Both were the number one university priority (+5) and received the same scoring in the Renovation and Replacement (+0) criteria. The only exception was that USF received additional points

(+2) because they provided 2% of the project's funding and 25% of total project costs from donations (+12). While these are essentially the same project, UCF's was ranked 17<sup>th</sup>, and USF's ranked 6<sup>th</sup> improving the odds that they'll get funded. Duane Siemen mentioned that all of the projects that received funding had either a percentage of the building costs provided by the university or private funding. Unless the statute changes, the only way to get state funding is to raise donations. Christy Miranda asked if carry forward funds could be counted towards the percentage of a university's contribution to funding the project. Duane Siemen responded that carry forward dollars cannot be used for new construction if it's over 10,000 sq. ft. or \$2 M but may be used for renovation projects.

#### New business

Chuck Reilly and Brian Boyd prepared a proposal to be presented to the Provost from the USC that talks about comprehensive room scheduling. Essentially, we are suggesting that all rooms that are used for any class, lab or discussion section be included in Peoplesoft, Ad-Astra, and appear on student schedules. The advantages of implementing this change include better stewardship of space, ability to track space utilization, improved safety, minimize liability and ensure compliant room capacities. Colleges have been using rooms that don't appear on the schedule, which may violate fire marshal code or COVID capacity. This is one of the suggestions that was previously included in the USC White Paper. Don Merritt requested to include a bullet point to properly schedule maintenance of the instructional spaces. Often, the Office of Instructional Resources and FPC schedule maintenance work and discover there's a class using the space that wasn't documented. Don Merritt also requested that the scheduling information be locked into Ad-Astra two weeks before the start of the semester because TBA or TBD makes prepping the rooms difficult. Brian Boyd thinks that the Registrar's Office can help police spaces labeled as TBA, TBD or listing a space in the comments but not in the actual facility table by reaching out to units to clarify.