MINUTES
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Board of Trustees
Business Affairs Committee

March 30, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Susan Safran, Randall Kaplan, William Pratt, Richard Moore

MEMBERS ABSENT: Steve Hassenfelt

OTHER BOARD MEMBERS/GUESTS: Kate Barrett, Linda Brady, Mike Byers, Cherry Callahan, Terri Cartner, Carol Disque, Howard Doyle, Carolyn Ferree, Jill Hillyer, Donna Honeycutt, Mary Hummel, Bruce Milman, Scott Milman, Sharlene O’Neil, Fred Patrick, Dave Perrin, Jorge Quintal, Steve Roberson, Jessica Russo, Reade Taylor. Via phone: Earlene Hardie Cox

PROCEEDINGS: Ms. Safran called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. The minutes from the February 2, 2010 meeting were approved as distributed.

ACTION ITEMS

Parking Regulations (BAC-1)

Mr. Byers presented a proposal to make changes in the parking permits and lots as follows:

1. New Definition for Motor Vehicles - with the gas price increase we have seen an increase on campus of motorcycles, motor scooters, etc. We would propose a definition that any device in, upon or by which person or property is or may be transported or drawn upon the campus, except devices moved by human power. This recommendation is consistent with the Transportation Master Plan and Bicycle Master Plan to regulate all motorized vehicles for pedestrian safety.

2. Reduce Rate for the "M" Motorbike Permit - Rename and reduce the rate for the "M" motorcycle permit to "MMM" and reduce the annual rate from $165 per year to $50 per year and cover all types of motorbikes. The reduction would keep the rate of this permit to recognize the space this vehicle type takes in the parking inventory.

3. New Residential Permit "EB" - This would designate a new permit for residential students in reserved parking lots adjacent to campus. The annual rate for this permit would be $165. Transportation for these lots would be provided by the Spartan Chariot Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 1:30 a.m., Saturday from 5:30 p.m. to 3:00 a.m. and Sunday from 3:30 p.m. to 1:30 a.m. The EB permit would be valid on campus after 3 p.m. until 7:30 a.m. Monday through Friday. This will give students who store their vehicles, rather than commute, greater access and convenience to their vehicles.

4. "E" Permit Use - This would extend the hours for Park and Ride lots from 7 p.m. to 10 p.m. Monday through Thursday for evening classes. In addition the beginning time that the "E" permit would be used on campus would change from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m., consistent with the "EB" permit.
Dr. Moore asked if the "EB" permit would allow for overnight parking. Mr. Byers confirmed that the new permit would be overnight. Currently all vehicles have to be removed from the Coliseum parking lot by 10 p.m.

Dr. Moore asked if the Segway would also be included in the definition of motor vehicles. It is motorized and has two wheels, so it would be covered. Dr. Moore asked that we wordsmith BAC-1 to clarify these two items.

Dr. Moore moved for acceptance and Mr. Kaplan seconded. This item will be moved to the consent agenda for the full Board meeting.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Exterior Design Approval for Quad Residence Halls and Tower Village II for April 15, 2010 meeting - BAC-2

Mr. Quintal reported that the two upcoming projects will require approval of the elevations at the April 15 meeting. A work in progress of the elevation for Tower Village II was presented at the February Board meeting.

Process to Select Designers and CM@Risk - BAC-3

At the request of the Board, Mr. Quintal presented a PowerPoint presentation on the Designer Selection Procedures mandated by the State and General Administration of the UNC system. A copy of the presentation is attached.

Article 3D of State Statute 143-64.31 outlines the procurement of Architectural, Engineering, Surveying and Construction Manager at Risk services. Selections are based on qualifications, not price and resident firms have a preference. Resident is based on whether or not the firm paid unemployment or state taxes and the principal office is in the state in question. The UNC system established its own procedures for designer or consultant selection. In general, all State Building Commission prescribed policies for designer selection as outlined in the NCAC Subchapter 30D apply to constituent institutions of the University.

At UNCG the system is managed by Facilities Design and Construction. Fred Patrick and Howard Doyle have over twenty years experience each in this field. The Chancellor has the authority to select designers when the expenditure is $500,000 or less.

There are ten steps to the process.

1. Project Identification - the project is outlined and discussed with the users to begin developing the scope.

2. Public Announcement - the project is posted online through General Administration and the State Construction for a minimum of 30 days.

3. Receive Letters of Interest - letters from firm interested in the project are received by Facilities Design and Construction.
4. Pre-Selection Committee - a group of interested parties - users and staff from FDC - review the letters received and rate them on a matrix. This is sent to FDC via email for tally.

Mr. Kaplan asked what the work load would be for a member of the Board. How many interviews per month or quarter take place?

Mr. Quintal advised that this varies depending on the number of projects ready for designers or CM@Risk approval. Mr. Quintal will provide a general schedule for 2010-11. There were none this quarter, but we brought several to the Board in February. We plan for six years in advance, and have a good idea of the projects that will need Board designer or CM@Risk approval for the coming year.

5. Short List - 01NCAC 30D.0303 sets out the eleven criteria to be reviewed by the selection committee. These items vary in importance according to the project.
   a. Specialized or appropriate expertise in the type of project
   b. Past performance on similar projects (evaluations for every state project are on file at State Construction)
   c. Adequate staff and proposed design or consultant team for the project
   d. Current workload and State projects awarded
   e. Proposed design approach for the project including design team and consultants (we assure ourselves that they are familiar with the rules of State construction, for example, three submittals before pricing)
   f. Recent experience with project costs and schedules
   g. Construction administration capabilities
   h. Proximity to and familiarity with the area where the project is located
   i. Record of successfully completed projects without major legal or technical problems
   j. Other factors which may be appropriate for the project
   k. HUB participation on the design team and consultants (consideration of the UNC system only)

Dr. Moore asked about the 'appropriate expertise' area. If the architect had limited experience but hired a consultant who was best in the nation, would that raise the expertise quotient of the architect?

Mr. Quintal said it depends. If another team had stronger design experience, but the #2 consultant, one could not conclude without knowing all of the facts which would be better suited for our particular job. Each member considers on their own prior to the actual interviews.

6. Interview Briefing - two weeks prior to bringing the short listed firms in for interview, FDC holds a pre-interview meeting to go over the protocol of the interviews in specifics - how long, order of presenters, etc.

7. Interview/Rank Order - on the day of the interviews all short listed firms come and present with ideas and credentials to the selection committee. At the end of the day the committee reviews, discusses and agrees to the ranking of the top three. General statute states that designer is to be selected regardless of price. If fee negotiations with the designer are not successful, we move to our #2 choice for the job and so forth. These fees are negotiated after the Board has approved the selection.
Dr. Moore advised that he was unaware when the Board approved an action item that they were also giving permission to move to the second or third choice if fee negotiations broke down. Mr. Quintal agreed to change the wording of future action items.

Ms. Cox, attending by phone, questioned our HUB participation. Mr. Quintal advised that we work with civil and structural engineers that are HUBs and on the construction side we are now in the 27-28% range.

8. Selection - the top three candidates are brought to the Board for approval.

9. Communication - FDC lets everyone who was short listed know of the decision of the Board and negotiations are begun.

There is a 60 day process from Step 1 through Step 9. We attempt to arrange these meetings around the Board meetings because the designer cannot wait six to eight weeks after the interviews to know if they have been selected for the job.

10. Evaluation - this is mandated by the State and copies are held in the State Construction Office at the end of a project.

Mr. Quintal also reported that we have a selection process for those projects $500,000 and under with a smaller selection committee. This process only selects firms for 'the bench' in case a project comes up within their scope.

Dr. Moore asked how information items are handled in regards to the full Board. Ms. O'Neil asked if he wanted the full Board to see Mr. Quintal's presentation. Mr. Kaplan reminded the Board members out present that eight of the twelve have already seen it and he would prefer a copy to be sent and for Ms. Safran to mention it in her review of the committee meeting to the full Board. If anyone would like more, perhaps a webinar could be created and sent to the members.

Mr. Kaplan stated that the bigger question was what role should a Board member play in these selection committees. Since none of the members are construction experts, what can they add to the process?

Ms. Safran suggested that each new Board member attend an interview day as part of their orientation for joining the Board. This led to a discussion of other items that should be part of an orientation for new Board members, and what three or four major items should be discussed at the retreat scheduled for August 24.

The Board is in place to oversee the process, not necessarily participate in it, but ensure that the University follows its own guidelines in matters of policy such as designer selection, tuition and fees, athletics, etc.

Mr. Kaplan pointed out that part of their duty was to assist in selecting the best for the university in construction, not necessarily the ones residing in Guilford County because what we build on our campus is expected to last 100 years. He suggested that every new member make a review of Mr. Quintal's presentation and participate on one pre-selection committee as part of their
orientation and all current members attend at least one pre-selection meeting during the next year.

Dr. Moore asked Ms. O'Neil if a matrix could be created for the retreat outlining the major action items (such as tuition, fees, parking, designers, CM@Risk) that are brought to the Board annually so that an orientation guideline could be formed.

One of the overarching items that needs to be addressed at the retreat is the future funding of UNCG. As a non-flagship school, legislative funding will probably not be forthcoming in the near future, so alternate revenue streams need to be considered. This will also be presented at the Board of Trustees retreat.

Report on Architects/Designers Appointed by the Chancellor - BAC-4

There is a need for a space needs assessment for UNCG's Athletics Program. Thirteen letters of interest were received and the firm of Moser Mayer Phoenix/McMillan Pazdan Smith of Greensboro, NC was recommended due to their familiarity and relationship with the UNCG campus, the proposed team has adequate relevant experience and the team is available to complete the project in the time frame required.

There being no further business Ms. Safran adjourned the meeting at 10:14 a. m.

Respectfully submitted

_______________________
Donna Honeycutt