**Facilities Planning
& Management**
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON

MEETING MINUTES - APPROVED
Campus Planning Committee
March 9, 2023
Hybrid Meeting
Bascom Hall– Room 260 + Virtual WebEx
8:30am to 9:15am
NOTE: Reference meeting recording on CPC website

1.   CALL TO ORDER
      Present: Cathy Arnott Smith, Chris Bruhn, Duncan Carlsmith, Kate Corby, Yevgenya Grinblat, Joel
                     Gerrits, Diana Hess, Kurt Paulsen, Paul Peppard, Andrew Pietroske, Tom Purnell, Ian
                     Robertson, Karl Scholz, Bret Shaw, Lindsey Stoddard Cameron, Deneen Wellik, Mark
                     Wells, Eric Wilcots

      Excused: Craig Berridge, Doug Reindl, Liz Sadowski

      FP&M: Jim Bogan, Janine Glaeser, Chad Hinman, Lindsey Honeyager, Jon King, Brent Lloyd,
                     Jesse Luckey-Winters, Dennis Rodenberg, Manny Tarin, Margaret Tennessen, Cindy
                     Torstveit, Craig Weisensel, Aaron Williams

      Guests: Alex Roe

      a.   Scholz, committee chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30am.

2.   OLD BUSINESS
      a.   Approval of Meeting Minutes from February 16, 2023. **(ACTION ITEM)**
           ▪ **Minutes were approved unanimously.**
      b.   Update: 2023-25 Biennial Capital Budget (Torstveit)
           ▪ Torstveit: Reported out on Governor's recommendations released on February 28, 2023.
             Funds were slightly adjusted for inflation per the Engineering News Index. All the GFSB
             funding was changed to Cash with State surplus dollars. UW-Madison is working with UW
             System and UW Relations to ensure we are briefing legislatures about our priorities.
                ▪ Shaw: The Governor's budget does not always align with the legislature's budget;
                  how do those discussions work behind the scenes?
                     o   Torstveit: UW works with UW System and UW Relations to advocate for
                         our projects and improvements on the process and efficiency.
                ▪ Purnell: When you say increase, are those permanent increases going forward.
                     o   Torstveit: This is a recommendation and not in the State budget at this
                         point. If the change passes and the threshold is adjusted, it becomes
                         permanent.
                ▪ Scholz: This is a positive first step but remember that Governors' initial
                  recommendations are typically not what is eventually signed.

3.   NEW BUSINESS

a. 2025-27 BCB Planning Process & Principles (O'Higgins/Williams)
Presentation given around revisions to the BCB process and streamlining based on committee discussion from the February 16, 2023, meeting. The overall goal is to reduce administrative burden for S/C/D units, FP&M, and committee review. Additionally, the rubric is being reviewed by a third party to understand its fit and fairness.

- Stoddard-Cameron: What is the current Minor project threshold?
  o O'Higgins: Currently it is $7.4M.
- Provost: It is a lot of work for those involved in the process to give presentations on all their needs in their S/C/D. At the end of the day, we know only 3-5 projects will be advanced. We also understand the importance of seeing projects from across the institution to inform decision making and understand the breadth and depth of need. I use ROTC as a project that has been on the list for many biennia, and it would be easy to forget about absence a presentation. There are many things we would like to see but it is difficult to see it all and not the most efficient use of the committee time. How do we strike a balance between what is presented and what is not? FP&M will recommend the committee sees 20+/- projects, the committee will then review the comprehensive list and may add additional projects they would like to see until we land at a comfortable location. Any project that makes the list will have a 1-page summary which the committee can use for information and determination. We are looking for broad agreement around this idea at today's meeting.
- Paulson: I presume we would get the information in advance?
  o Provost: Yes, absolutely it must be worked into the schedule.
- Shaw: As an idea, certain grant proposals require basic information upfront which the decision body reviews and either requests more pertinent information to move forward or else files appropriately.
  o Provost: I would really like the committee to be the entity to identify what additional presentations they would like to see to avoid the 'old way' of doing it, which was not terrible, it just requires a lot of work.
- Grinblat: The background information was very appreciated. Can we request seeing the previously presentations?
  o Past biennia presentations are located here during meetings that occurred in the Fall of odd numbered years. They are broken out by S/C/D. https://cpla.fpm.wisc.edu/planning/campus-planning-committee-cpc/
- Hess: If it does not work, we can go back to the old way or create a third way. I enjoy the 1-pager as it reminds me of being on a search committee and being able to pull out and sort the information easily. From a workload perspective it makes sense to streamline, but this background information is critical to provide the necessary information for deliberation of the group.
- Purnell: Can you help me understand the timeline of what is being proposed?
  o O'Higgins: Now through summer will be the bulk of the S/C/D work with committee work occurring in the Fall and an eventual decision necessary by the end of November of this year.
  o Provost: 1-pagers over the summer and release for committee review prior to presentations. Presentation lists will have to be known by early September or sooner.
- Robertson: The idea of 1-pagers and streamlining the presentations is favored. Can there be something for the committee to vote on with the projects they would like to see to get at a reasonable number.
- Paulson: I appreciate the fact that the committee gets the right to ask for additional presentations in the name of Shared Governance, and fully understand FP&M has their pulse on the projects.
- Bruhn: Does this process differentiate based on funding source at all?
  o Torstveit: The list and one-pagers will need to identify the anticipated funding source for committee review. FP&M will work with the S/C/D to identify the funding source.
  o Provost: Not that I am the final decider but would suggest that a major gift/grant funded project should be seen.

- Stoddard-Cameron: Would FP&M bring the entire project list to the committee based on how they stack up universally?
    - Torstveit: Yes, all projects will still be ranked and reviewed based on the guiding principles established.
    - Stoddard-Cameron: Additionally, would this list indicate where significant infrastructure issues exist?
    - Williams: This is baked into the rubric, but not ear marked for notification specifically.
    - Torstveit: We could attempt to add some of these notes, but every building will mostly likely have an infrastructural deficiency and needing a note which may not be overly informative.
- Hess: Timing question. When does the CPC see the ranking? One way is for the CPC to see the list of 20 that FP&M has developed. CPC reviews all the 1-pagers and determines if more presentations should be added. For the sake of deliberation, the other way is for the CPC to rank prior to FP&M's list and see if anything is elevated without influence and then compare those two lists to determine what gets presented. What is the purpose of the ranking to the process and at what point is that purpose best realized?
    - Torstveit: Ranking is important to ensure the guiding principles are met as well as understanding the facility condition assessment. Timing is critical.
    - Hess: Does the CPC need FP&M's list first? What if the CPC knew the projects on the list, but not the order of priority?
    - Provost: I worry about transparency. The value of the ranking is the rubric whereby FP&M can translate campus priorities into a single score. I think it would be important for the committee to see the complete list of 120+ projects prior to going into the elevating process. The first step of the committee; review the FP&M list and one-pagers. The second step is for CPC to elevate projects to determine what they would like to see for presentations and finally either agreeing with the FP&M list or changing it based on the outcomes of the process.
- Stoddard-Cameron: As an English major, I am looking at the ranking list and principles to give a red, yellow, green to understand what should be presented and understand how the project attends to campus priorities.
    - Torstveit: This is why FP&M takes the time and does the ranking.
    - Williams: At the end of the day, it is imperfect, but we want to make sure it is a process that is defensible and responsive, able to give a recommendation to the Chancellor.
- Provost: If I am reading the room right the committee is open to FP&M implementing this process and seeing where it takes us.
- Paulson: The ultimate end game is a recommendation to the ELT. Therefore, it is important to have FP&M's ranking earlier in the process. The CPC should not expend the energy to recommend a project that has no chance.

4. ANNOUCEMENTS
    a. Next meeting is April 20, 2023.
        - Committee Members please attend in person at Bascom Hall Room 260.
        - Guests & Interested Parties please attend virtually

Meeting Date	Tentative Agenda Topic(s)	Location
NOTE: FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS MAY MOVE DATES AND ARE INDICATED AS REFERENCE ONLY		
April 20, 2023	2025-27 Biennial Capital Budget 2025 Campus Comprehensive Plan Discussion	260 Bascom Hall In-Person + WebEx
May 18, 2023	2025-27 Biennial Capital Budget Campus Framework Plan Discussion	260 Bascom Hall In-Person + WebEx

5. MEETING ADJOURNMENT
    a. Scholz adjourned the meeting at 9:14am