

**Declaration to Minutes  
of May 2, 2012  
WVUIT Facilities Subcommittee**

In the May 2, 2012, meeting of the WVUIT Facilities Subcommittee, I voted to approve "the priority deferred maintenance/project funding totaling \$7,832,000 for presentation to and consideration by the full Committee."

Research following this meeting revealed that the deferred project/expenditures that were presented to the Subcommittee for approval were not based upon the recommendations as set forth in the Revitalization Project for WVUIT Team Report (dated October 7, 2011) but, instead, were based entirely upon the WVUIT Integrated Facilities Plan (dated May 2011) as presented by Sightlines.

Therefore, my contention is that I voted upon the motion to approve these projects/expenditures without the knowledge that the projects/expenditures did not concur with the recommendations as set forth in the Revitalization Project Plan per Senate Bill 486.

Attached is the document which is the basis of my research in this matter. This document was forwarded via email to Chancellor Paul Hill with copies to members of the full Committee on July 11, 2012.

Therein, I am requesting that this written communication and the attached document, Tech Revitalization Subcommittee Actions, be recorded as an attachment to the Subcommittee minutes of May 2, 2012, and the full Committee minutes pertaining to this vote.

Dorothy Phillips  
Signature

7/16/12  
Date

**Revitalization of the Tech Campus**  
**Senate Bill 486, 2011**  
**Tech Facilities Subcommittee Actions**

Senate Bill 486, revitalization of the Tech campus, was passed in the Senate with a vote of 29 yeas, 0 nays, and 5 no votes and in the House with 94 yeas, 4 nays, and 2 no votes during the 2011 legislative session.

According to the *Revitalization Project for West Virginia University Institute of Technology Team Report* (hereafter, referred to as Team Report), page 3, "To accomplish this [the revitalization project], the legislation [SB486] instructs the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission (HEPC) to establish a Team to study the needs and potential remedies for WVU-Tech. Members of the Team have more than 230 years of higher education experience."

Upon reviewing all of the projects and expenditures that the Tech Facilities Subcommittee (hereafter, referred to as FS) has approved for the revitalization of the Montgomery campus, I find that we, members of the FS, have not followed the recommendations as set forth in the Team Report—the intent of SB486. The FS has clearly relied upon the Sightlines Integrated Facilities Plan, dated May 2011—as contracted through the University—for our approval actions. (The Sightlines plan was developed during the same time period that the Legislature was dealing with the composition/passage of SB486.)

Per the following quote from the Team Report, page 25, *Capital Improvements*, the Team had some reservations about the Sightlines report:

"Those costs are embedded in any work that is completed at WVU-Tech and must always be reflected in project estimation."

"The use of a local architectural/engineering (A/E) firm would have been advantageous for the Sightlines group. The Team is concerned there were no A/E firms or technical designers used by Sightlines in developing the WVU-Tech report. The experience and knowledge of the campus facilities group is critical to the information in the Sightlines report but architects and engineers should drive the facilities examination and proper estimations."

Following are the recommendations pertaining to facilities/capital improvements that the Team Report, page 26, presented **for Year One**. Following each of the Team recommendations is my understanding of the status of actions taken by FS in

correlation with our approval of \$7,832,000 (hereafter, referred to as \$7.8 million) expenditures--purportedly to be submitted to the Legislature in July 2012.

1. ***Immediately replace the elevators for the Engineering Building.***
  - A. Facilities Subcommittee approved expenditures to “replace 2 elevators” in Engineering Classroom Building per Sightlines ID59 of WVUIT Deferred Maintenance/Project Budget Request – FY 2013 (hereafter, referred to as TB2013) through the \$7.8 million.
2. ***Immediately install campus-wide Wi-Fi.***
  - A. Per verbal notification through FS, it is my understanding that Wi-Fi is being installed campus-wide and that expense is not being channeled through the FS.
3. ***Immediately replace the main underground electrical feed and distribution system to the campus.***
  - A. To my knowledge, this recommendation (or expense thereof) has not been discussed at a FS meeting. However, it is understood that new underground cabling applicable to Orndorff Hall, Conley Hall, Tech Center, Maclin Hall, and Ratliff Hall is being/has been replaced. (Have no knowledge of new underground cabling relative to the other buildings on campus.)
4. ***Immediately start a design build HVAC/BAS for Ratliff to expedite having another dorm with air-conditioning on-line.***
  - A. FS approved expenditures for “Upgrade HVAC System” in Ratliff Hall per Sightlines ID60 (page 2) of TB2013 through \$7.8 million.
5. ***Immediately make a determination if Co-Ed Hall is to be razed or renovated (approximate cost of each are outlined in Randolph Engineering report dated April 26, 2011).***
  - A. Immediately following the October 2011 LOCEA Meeting, WVU made the decision to raze Co-Ed during the summer of 2012. However, the Team recommended to “start the design build renovation or demolition/design-build replacement of Co-Ed” **during Year Two.**
6. ***Immediately start a full design build renovation for Orndorff.***
  - A. FS has addressed no “full design build renovation for Orndorff” through the \$7.8 million (or through the \$4,862,000). The FS did approve expenditures through the \$7.8 million for Orndorff “HVAC System and Control Upgrades” per Sightlines ID191 of TB2013 and “Roof Replacement” per Sightlines ID42 of TB2013. (The only project for Orndorff that was addressed through the \$4,862,000 is “New Elevators” per Sightlines ID46 of TB2013.)
7. ***Re-commission/Retro-commission the HVAC system for Vining Library, Engineering and the Engineering Lab Building to reduce energy cost, provide better occupant comfort and minimize the maintenance***

*burden for the facilities group until funds are available to address other needs in these facilities.*

- A. Vining Library HVAC – FS has not addressed this recommendation through the \$7.8 million.
  - B. Engineering and Engineering Lab Building HVAC – FS approved an expense through the \$7.8 million for “HVAC” in the Engineering Classroom Building per Sightlines ID126 of TB2013.
8. *Complete aesthetics upgrades to the Vining Library.*
- A. FS has addressed no aesthetics upgrades to the Vining Library per the \$7.8 million. In fact, FS has not considered/approved **any** expenditure for the Vining Library per the \$7.8 million. (Reportedly, the proposed Student Success Center in Vining is being financed through the legislative \$750,000 handled through HEPC.)

## SUMMARY

The Facilities Subcommittee **approved** the following projects/expenditures (through the \$7.8 million) that the Team Report **did not** recommend for Year One:

Baisi Center – \$1,828,000, Sightlines ID65\*, ID93, and ID12\*  
Ratliff Hall -- \$3,645,000, Sightlines ID60\* (page 1), ID33, ID138, ID55, ID48,  
ID141, and ID150  
(\*State Fire Marshal Requirements)

The Facilities Subcommittee **did not** address and/or **approve** the following projects/expenditures (through the \$7.8 million) as recommended in the Team Report for Year One:

1. No. 3. *Immediately replace the main underground electrical feed and distribution system to the campus.* Details outlined in above No. 3.
2. No. 5. *Immediately make a determination if Co-Ed Hall is to be razed or renovated (approximate cost of each outline in Randolph Engineering’s report dated April 26, 2011).* Details outlined in above No. 5.
3. No. 6. *Immediately start a full design build renovation for Orndorff Hall.* Details outlined in above No. 6.
4. No. 8. *Complete aesthetics upgrades to the Vining Library.* Details outlined in above No. 8.

Therefore, I, as a member of the Tech Facilities Subcommittee, have concerns about our approval procedures for these projects and expenditures.

Former Chancellor Noland was gracious and understanding enough to find monies to finance this revitalization project for Tech through HEPC. The Legislature was concerned and gracious enough to work diligently for the creation/passage of SB486, revitalization project on the Montgomery campus. The Team was concerned and gracious enough to work diligently in its endeavors for the revitalization of the Tech campus per SB486.

Since it well appears that Tech will be relying upon the generosity of the Legislature to finance a large portion of these expenses, we, as a group, should make every effort to acknowledge and honor the Legislature's intent for Senate Bill 486 as presented through the *Revitalization Project for West Virginia University Institute of Technology Team Report*.

Thanks!  
Dorothy Phillips