

The official minutes of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees are maintained by the Secretary of the Board. Certified copies of minutes may be requested by contacting the Board of Trustees' Office at trustees@sc.edu. Electronic or other copies of original minutes are not official Board of Trustees' documents.

University of South Carolina  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Buildings and Grounds Committee

September 17, 2010

The Buildings and Grounds Committee of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees met on Friday, September 17, 2010, at 9:30 a.m. in the 1600 Hampton Street Board Room.

Members present were: Mr. Mark W. Buyck, Jr., Chairman; Mr. Herbert C. Adams; Mr. Greg Gregory; Mr. William C. Hubbard; Mr. William W. Jones, Jr.; Mr. Toney J. Lister; Ms. Leah B. Moody; Mr. Miles Loadholt, Board Chairman; and Mr. Eugene P. Warr, Jr., Board Vice Chairman. Mr. John C. von Lehe, Jr. was absent.

Other Trustees present were Mr. Chuck Allen; Mr. J. Egerton Burroughs; Mr. W. Lee Bussell, Sr.; Dr. C. Edward Floyd; Dr. C. Dorn Smith; Mr. Thad H. Westbrook; and Mr. Mack I. Whittle.

Others present were: President Harris Pastides; Secretary Thomas L. Stepp; Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost Michael D. Amiridis; Vice President for Finance and Planning William T. Moore; Vice President for Student Affairs and Vice Provost for Academic Support Dennis Pruitt; Vice President for Advancement Michelle D. Dodenhoff; Vice President for Communications Luanne Lawrence; General Counsel Walter (Terry) H. Parham; Associate Vice President for Resource Planning, Division of Finance and Planning, Edward L. Walton; Associate Vice President for Facilities Tom Quasney; Associate Vice President for Housing and Student Development, Division of Student Affairs and Academic Support, Gene Luna; Associate Vice President for Administration, Division of Student Affairs and Academic Support, Stacey Bradley; Associate Vice President of Business Affairs, Division of Finance and Planning, Helen Zeigler; Chief Financial Officer, Office of Foundations, Russell H. Meekins; Director of the Alumni Association Marsha D. Cole; Director of Athletics Eric C. Hyman; Director of Capital Budgets and Financing, Division of Finance and Planning, Charlie Fitzsimons; Director of Facilities Operations and Maintenance, Division of Facilities, Jim Demarest; Director of Facilities Planning and Construction, Division of Facilities, Jeff Lamberson; Vice Provost for Faculty Development Christine W. Curtis; Chancellor of USC Upstate John C. Stockwell; Dean of USC Lancaster John Catalano; Chief Financial Officer, Department of Athletics, Jeff Tallant; Deputy Athletics Director Marcy Girton; Executive Associate Athletics Director Kevin O'Connell; Special Assistant to the President J. Cantey Heath; Special Assistant to the President and Athletics Director John D. Gregory; NCAA/SEC Representative for the University Zach Keleher; Director of Governmental and Community Relations and Legislative Liaison Shirley D. Mills; Associate Director of Governmental

Affairs and Legislative Liaison Casey Martin; Assistant Chancellor for Facilities Management, USC Aiken, Mike Jara; Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Gamecock Club Chip Comer; Chair of the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, School of Medicine, Elizabeth G. Baxley; Director of the Children's Law Center, Harry W. Davis Jr.; Sr. Project Manager, Facilities Planning and Construction, Thomas Opal; Department of Facilities Joy Gillespie; Chair of the Faculty Senate Patrick D. Nolan; Director of Periodicals, University Publications, Chris Horn; Director of Media Relations, Office of Communications, Margaret Lamb; Heather Mitchell, The Boudreaux Group; University Technology Services Production Manager Justin Johnson; and Board staff members Terri Saxon, Vera Stone, and Karen Tweedy.

Chairman Buyck welcomed everyone. Ms. Lamb introduced members of the media who were in attendance.

Chairman Buyck called the meeting to order and stated that notice of the meeting had been posted and the press notified as required by the Freedom of Information Act; the agenda and supporting materials had been circulated to the members; and a quorum was present to conduct business.

Chairman Buyck stated that there were contractual matters related to gift naming opportunities, which were appropriate for discussion in Executive Session. Mr. Lister moved to enter Executive Session and Mr. Jones seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

The following persons were invited to remain: President Pastides, Secretary Stepp, Dr. Amiridis, Dr. Moore, Dr. Pruitt, Dr. Kresovich, Ms. Owens, Dr. Hogue, Dr. Plyler, Ms. Dodenhoff, Ms. Lawrence, Mr. Parham, Mr. Walton, Ms. Brunelli, Mr. Quasney, Mrs. Hanna, Mr. Heath, Mr. Hyman, Mr. Tallant, Ms. Girton, Mr. Gregory, Ms. Mills, Mrs. Martin, and Ms. Lamb.

Return to Open Session

I. Project Approval (Phase I):

Chairman Buyck called on Dr. Moore to present the Phase I Project Approval requests. He explained that all project requests had received carefully by the Capital Planning Process.

Dr. Moore noted that in the event the Committee did not get through the entire agenda, there were parts of the agenda that could be delayed until a subsequent meeting. He noted that plans were underway for a called Buildings and Grounds Committee meeting in October. On the agenda were eleven Phase I projects which totaled \$115.5 million in total project costs. The funds for these projects came from the following sources:

\$ 17.5 million from research grants generated by USC Faculty

\$ 9.3 million from Housing Maintenance Funds (on-hand)

\$ 8 million from Institutional Funds (on-hand)

\$ 45.5 million from the Health Center Reserve Fund and a revenue bond for approximately \$36 million

\$ 27.2 million from Housing Maintenance Reserve Funds and a small revenue bond

\$ 8 million from an Institutional Bond supported from a county sales tax and private funds.

Dr. Moore stated that there were six Phase II projects and the funds for these projects came from the following sources:

\$ 3.1 million from Institutional Funds

\$ 1 million in Food Service Auxiliary Funds

\$ 3.6 million from Housing Maintenance Reserve Funds (on-hand)

Dr. Moore recapped that the capital projects presented today and those scheduled for consideration at the next Committee meeting, by December, totaled \$240 million. The rest of the funding involved private sources, institutional funds, federal lease funds, athletics revenues, and housing revenues. The University has had no state bond bill in ten years. Dr. Moore noted that industry standard metrics estimated the number of jobs to be at 4800 over the next three years as a result of the capital projects' expenditures.

Dr. Moore stated that all the current and anticipated debt had been examined by Barclays and their assessment was that the University's Aa2 rating was robust enough to hold all the debt.

Dr. Moore called on Mr. Quasney to present the projects.

A. Horizon I Upfit Ground and Fourth Floors: This project would upfit the current shell space on the ground and fourth floors in Horizon I to provide research laboratories, office and support space. The first floor was designated for a Centers of Economic Excellence (CoEE) Endowed Chair for Clean Coal and for Idea Labs,

as the Innovista Wet Lab Incubation Facility. The second floor was occupied by a CoEE Endowed Chair for Polymer Nanocomposites and support research staff. The third floor was occupied by a CoEE Endowed Chair for Solid Oxide Fuel Cells and support research staff.

The ground floor has been identified for a CoEE Endowed Chair for Nuclear Science and Energy, a CoEE Endowed Chair for Nuclear Science Strategies, and support research staff. The fourth floor has been identified for CoEE Endowed Chairs for Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Economy, a CoEE Endowed Chair for Renewable Fuel Cells and support research staff. This project would complete the construction and upfitting of the Horizon I research facility.

The estimated cost for the project was \$7 million and would be funded with Grant Generated (Indirect Cost Recovery) Funds. Approval was requested to fund the initial design, development of a cost estimate, development of a schedule and provide a LEED cost benefit analysis for the project.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to establish this project for Phase I Design with a budget of \$105,000 funded with Grant Generated (Indirect Cost Recovery) Funds. Mr. Hubbard so moved and Mr. Jones seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

B. Discovery I Upfit Third, Fourth and Fifth Floors: This project would upfit current shell space on floors three, four and five in Discovery I to provide research laboratories, office and support space. Current occupants on floors one and two were Cancer Prevention and Control and Communication Disorders, including a CoEE Endowed Chair for Brain Imaging and a CoEE Endowed Chair for Senior Smart: Brain Smart, part of the Arnold School of Public Health.

The third floor was identified for the Brain and Behavior Institute consisting of a CoEE Endowed Chair for Cancer Therapeutics, a CoEE Endowed Chair for Healthful Lifestyles, a CoEE Endowed Chair for Cancer Disparities, a CoEE Endowed Chair for Rehabilitation and Reconstruction, and offices and laboratories for support research staff of the Arnold School of Public Health, and temporary animal research facilities for use in conjunction with the animal research facilities on the first floor. The fourth floor was identified for offices and laboratories for support research staff of the Arnold School of Public Health. The fifth floor was identified for offices and laboratories for support research staff of the Arnold School of Public Health. Specific needs would be determined by the programmatic requirements of the functions designated. This project will complete the construction and upfitting of the Discovery I research facility.

The estimated cost for the project was \$10.5 million and would be funded with grant generated (Indirect Cost Recovery) funds. Approval was requested to fund the initial design, development of a cost estimate, development of a schedule and provide a LEED cost benefit analysis for the project.

Mr. Quasney noted that both the Discovery I and Horizon I buildings would be would fully occupied upon completion of these two projects.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to establish this project for Phase I Design with a budget of \$157,500 funded with Grant Generated (Indirect Cost Recovery) Funds. Mr. Hubbard so moved and Mr. Gregory seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

C. Assembly Street Tunnel and Crossing: This project would modify the existing pedestrian tunnel under Assembly Street with entry at the Law Center and exit at the Coliseum. The modifications would allow a safer alternative to students crossing Assembly Street to attend classes in the new Darla Moore School of Business, Coliseum and the developing Innovista District. In addition, improved traffic signaling and crossing would be included for pedestrians crossing Assembly Street.

Currently the tunnel was only accessible by a set of steps that presented a 36-foot grade change from the Law Center to the fountain plaza below, and no ADA access was provided. To improve accessibility to the pedestrian tunnel, modifications of existing green space in front of the Law Center would provide a gentle, ADA-compliant ramp from Main Street to the existing fountain. The fountain area would be replaced with an outdoor amphitheater. In addition, an elevator would be installed to provide the most efficient means of ADA accessibility. The landscaping on either side of the ramp will provide clear access to the main entrance of the Law Center.

The estimated cost for the project was \$4 million and would be funded with Institution Funds. Approval was requested to fund the initial design, development of a cost estimate, and development of a schedule.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to establish this project for Phase I Design with a budget of \$60,000 funded with Institution Funds. Ms. Moody so moved and Mr. Lister seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

D. Student Health Center Construction: This project was to construct a new facility to replace the existing student health center. The newly constructed health center would provide the design and square footage needed to appropriately and comprehensively serve today's college student's health care needs. This project

would increase the space for the various clinics, lab, pharmacy and health care education from approximately 38,000 gross square feet to 100,000 square feet. It would also allow the counseling center and disability services offices to co-locate in this new facility and open space for other uses in Byrnes and LeConte. The need for this size of center was determined by a feasibility study conducted last year by an independent architectural/engineering team.

The current health center was cited by the past four accreditation reports as inadequate for the size of our current student body. It was built in 1972 when USC had just over 19,000 students, whereas today there are nearly 30,000 students. Additionally, a facility audit of the current center determined the building had a facility condition index of 0.86, which indicated that renovations to address deferred maintenance and building code issues would cost 86 percent of what a new facility would cost. The current center was also poorly designed for today's ambulatory care.

Students have been supporting a dedicated portion of the health fee for a new, expanded health center. The dedicated portion of the fee began in FY06 at a level of \$6 per student per semester, and grew to \$23 in FY10. Both the Student Government Association and the Residence Hall Association passed resolutions recommending the construction of a new health center with expanded capacity for additional services. The Parents Advisory Council voiced support for the project as well.

A feasibility study provided an estimated cost for the project of \$45.5 million and would be funded with a combination of Health Center Capital Reserve Funds and Revenue Bonds. Approval was requested to fund the initial design, development of a cost estimate, development of a schedule and provide a LEED cost benefit analysis for the project.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to establish this project for Phase I Design, with a budget of \$682,500 funded with Health Center Capital Reserve Funds.

Mr. Hubbard so moved and Mr. Jones seconded the motion.

Chairman Buyck asked Dr. Pruitt where the building would be located and he said on the current Student Health Center site. It would be built in two phases. Phase I would be built around the current facility. Once completed, staff would move into the new phase and the old facility would be demolished to allow for the construction of Phase II. The entire project was estimated to take four years to complete.

Dr. Floyd asked Mr. Hyman if the Athletics Department had a future plan for a sports medicine center. Mr. Hyman responded that over two years ago discussions were held with the USC School of Medicine (SOM) regarding the possibility of developing a sports medicine complex at the Athletics Village at the Roost. The SOM's proposal included elements so expensive, the Athletics Department felt that it was too expensive overall. Therefore, the Department began moving toward an Athletics Performance Center,

which was a much smaller and less expensive version of the SOM plan. The Athletics Performance Center included sports medicine.

The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

E. South Tower Mechanical Renovation: This project was a comprehensive replacement of the building mechanical system. It would include conversion from a two-pipe to four-pipe system; and would address humidity control and outside air supply to the building, thus reducing mold issues. All air handlers and fan coil units would be replaced. Additionally all associated pumps, piping, variable speed drives, valves and controls would be replaced. All equipment would be connected to the University's central control system. Any remaining duct work would be cleaned and sanitized. Grills would be replaced. Any remaining dampers and actuators would be inspected, tested and replaced as necessary. All building exhaust systems would be replaced. A commissioning process would be performed with comprehensive testing and balancing. Hazardous material would be evaluated and abated. The project was needed because systems were well beyond expected life cycle.

The estimated cost for this project was \$6.2 million to be funded with Housing Maintenance Reserve Funds. Approval was requested to fund the initial design, and development of a cost estimate, and development of a schedule.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to establish this project for Phase I Design with a budget of \$93,000 funded with Housing Maintenance Reserve Funds. Mr. Loadholt so moved and Ms. Gregory seconded the motion.

Chairman Buyck asked if the building would have to be shut down to do the work. Mr. Quasney responded that the plan was to do the work during summer breaks.

Mr. Hubbard asked what brought this project to the top of the priority list and Dr. Luna responded. He explained that several years ago there was a severe mold outbreak in the South Tower building, and that mechanical renovation would improve the air quality in the building.

The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

F. Women's Quadrangle Renovations: This project would modernize the Women's Quad in the central area of the campus where Sims, McClintock, and Wade Hampton residence halls are located. The project included interior repairs, installation of new finishes and furnishings, and building system upgrades (plumbing, mechanical, electrical). Exterior repairs would include improvements to the building shell and underground utilities. In addition, a new elevator would be installed in

each building. Conversion to suite-style rooms would be evaluated. Building system upgrades were needed due to the age and condition of existing equipment.

This project was the next major upgrade priority for University Housing and would begin after the Patterson Hall renovation was completed in August 2011. The Women's Quad has 551 beds combined between three residence halls. Phase I would include the feasibility of renovating all three halls during the same year for cost savings.

The estimated cost for this project was \$27.2 million to be funded with Housing Maintenance Reserve Funds and Revenue Bonds. Approval was requested to fund the initial design, development of a cost estimate, development of a schedule and provide a LEED cost benefit analysis for the project.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to establish this project for Phase I Design with a budget of \$408,000 funded with Housing Maintenance Reserve Funds. Ms. Moody so moved and Mr. Jones seconded the motion.

Chairman Buyck asked if the plan was to close the facilities only during the summer breaks, so as not to reduce available on campus housing, and Mr. Quasney confirmed that that was the plan. Dr. Pruitt clarified that what they hoped to determine in Phase I was whether there was a tremendous cost savings by doing all three residence halls at one time, off-line, rather than staging the project over time. Should the cost saving be so great that the request would be to take all three residents off line at one time, they would provide an alternate housing plan for those students displaced by the project.

Discussion followed regarding the actual design and detail for residence halls, and whether they were too extravagant. Dr. Pruitt stated that there was an approximately \$350,000 Housing Master Plan being developed would come before the Committee for consideration following all required processes. The Plan would include consideration of the types of residence halls to construct, current market conditions, competition both on and off campus, private/public partnerships, etc.

Mr. Jones asked that after the residence hall renovations if the rooms were re-priced to cover the additional capital and the maintenance and operational costs. Mr. Luna answered that if the renovations resulted in additional amenities to the hall, it would be re-priced based on the amenities. However, if the renovation was to address deferred maintenance, it did not necessarily result in re-pricing of the hall.

The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

G. Preston College Bathroom and Flooring Renovations: Preston College was constructed in 1939 and houses the Preston Residential College Program. The facility required the installation of a fire protection system. This project was a comprehensive renovation of approximately 80 student bathrooms and flooring in 120 student rooms. The

project would include removal of all hazardous materials, demolition of existing shower enclosures, correct any water leaks, repair any damaged wall surface, install a water tight shower, replace water closet and plumbing fixtures, install dual flush devices on water closet, replace floor tile in bathrooms, ensure that all exhaust and ventilation systems are adequate and operating properly, ensure that all bathroom and associated building drains are operating properly, replace ceiling tile and grid, replace bathroom window if necessary, and paint entire bathroom including doors and trim. This project would install shower curtains, rods, grab bars and blocking as necessary.

The second part of the project was to replace the vinyl composite tile flooring in all student rooms with either tile or simulated wood vinyl planking. The removal and disposal of hazardous materials associated with Asbestos Containing Material in floor tiles and mastic is included.

This project was necessary to protect residents with state of the art fire suppression and to address deferred maintenance, particularly in plumbing systems that are well past their expected life.

The estimated cost for this project was \$1.5 million to be funded with Housing Maintenance Reserve Funds. Approval was requested to fund the initial design, development of a cost estimate, development of a schedule and provide a LEED cost benefit analysis for the project.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to establish this project for Phase I Design with a budget of \$22,500 funded with Housing Maintenance Reserve Funds. Mr. Adams so moved and Mr. Jones seconded the motion.

Mr. Jones asked if statistical data could be provided to show if the university's housing options were competitive to private off campus housing. Dr. Luna said that he would provide that information.

Mr. Westbrook asked if the University had engineering capabilities for smaller projects rather than bidding them out. Mr. Quasney responded yes, and that they utilize them when appropriate.

The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

H. Capstone Campus Room Upgrades: The Capstone Campus Room was a significant campus asset that was overdue for renovation. Used by the entire campus community, as well as the Capstone Scholars program, the room needed deferred maintenance addressed along with bringing it up to today's meeting room standards. This project would replace three air handlers supporting this important meeting and conference center. The current units were beyond their life expectancy and generate excessive noise levels that detract from the functions held in this venue. The project would also include improvement

of the lighting, smart room audiovisual systems, and room finishes (carpet, drapes, and walls).

The estimated cost for this project was \$700,000 to be funded with Housing Maintenance Reserve Funds. Approval was requested to fund the initial design, development of a cost estimate, development of a schedule and provide a LEED cost benefit analysis for the project.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to establish this project for Phase I Design with a budget of \$10,500 funded with Housing Maintenance Reserve Funds. Mr. Adams so moved and Mr. Gregory seconded the motion.

The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

I. McBryde Renovations: In addition to housing 250 students, McBryde also hosted a number of learning communities including the Pre-Medical Community, Music Community, and the Pre-Law Community. This project actually began in April of 2010, with Board approval and funding of \$495,000 and was titled McBryde Student Room Upgrades. After the start of the project, unforeseen life safety issues were recognized which required immediate replacement. Additional improvements were also recommended, which included replacement of exterior and corridor doors, and installation of card access. The project was in the process of being re-scoped and the estimated cost now required establishment of a capital project.

The estimated cost for this project was \$900,000 to be funded with Housing Maintenance Reserve Funds. Approval was requested to fund the initial design, development of a cost estimate, development of a schedule and provide a LEED cost benefit analysis for the project.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to establish this project for Phase I Design with a budget of \$13,500 funded with Housing Maintenance Reserve Funds. Mr. Jones so moved and Ms. Moody seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

J. USC Upstate Administration Building Repairs and Renovation:

The Administration Building was the first building constructed on the USC Upstate campus in 1969. The 43,000 gross square foot building houses the Chancellor's Office, Alumni Relations, Special Events, Academic Affairs, University Advancement, Human Resources, University Communications, Information Technology Services, and the Advanced Digital Media Lab.

This project would correct major deficiencies with the major building systems and renovate spaces for current programs in the building. The existing mechanical system was original to the building. Currently portable cooling units and supplemental

mechanical units have been installed to enable continued operations. The electrical systems in the building were undersized and cannot meet the current electrical requirements. Plumbing systems were likewise outdated. Water to the entire building must be shut off for repairs to be made. The building houses the Information Technology function for the campus and unreliable services impact the entire campus network and related functions.

In addition, life safety upgrades would be performed to include reporting devices for fire and smoke detection. Renovations would provide adequate and proper space for all building functions that directly support the academic mission.

The estimated cost for this project was \$4 million to be funded with Institutional Capital Project Funds. Approval was requested to fund the initial design, development of a cost estimate, development of a schedule and provide a LEED cost benefit analysis for the project.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to establish this project for Phase I Design with a budget of \$60,000 funded with ICPF. Mr. Lister so moved and Mr. Lister seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

K. USC Lancaster Classroom Building Construction: This new building would consist of approximately 30,000 - 35,000 gross square feet situated in the central part of the campus between the Bradley Arts and Sciences Building and Medford Library. The building would primarily be a general classroom facility featuring state-of-the-art instructional facilities, modern faculty and staff offices and common areas. Space for astronomy studies might be incorporated as well. Conceptual design on the proposed site suggested incorporating a small amphitheatre for gatherings.

The last new classroom building on the Lancaster campus was the Bradley Arts and Sciences Building constructed in 1999. Since then, enrollment on the campus increased 54 percent in headcount, which required additional instructional and office space.

The building project would be financed via an institutional bond and repaid with tuition revenue. Tuition revenue would be supplanted in part from the Educational Foundation of USC Lancaster's 50th Anniversary Capital Campaign (\$2.6 million had been pledged to date for this project) and through a county property tax millage increase for USC Lancaster. Classrooms and offices would be furnished using funds from the Lancaster County Commission for Higher Education. USC Lancaster administration was very confident that Lancaster County Council would enact the millage increase in support of this project. Phase I of the project could be funded from campaign pledge receipts already collected and on deposit with the Educational Foundation of USC Lancaster.

The estimated cost for this project was \$8 million to be funded with Institutional Bond Funds, Lancaster County Appropriations and Private Funds. Approval was requested to

fund the initial design, development of a cost estimate, development of a schedule and provide a LEED cost benefit analysis for the project.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to establish this project for Phase I Design with a budget of \$120,000 funded with Private Funds. Mr. Gregory so moved and Ms. Moody seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

II. Project Approval (Phase 2):

Chairman Buyck asked Dr. Moore to briefly explain the difference between Phase I and Phase II projects. Dr. Moore stated that projects designated as Phase I and II, were projects with a total cost exceeding \$500,000. Phase I was the initial architectural (A/E) and engineering work. Phase II was the completion of the A/E and the construction.

A. Davis College HVAC Replacement: This project was approved for Phase I approval in October 2008. Davis College, originally constructed in 1909, contains approximately 23,000 gross square feet. The building was heated and cooled by fan coil units that are over 30 years old. These units were in poor condition and were part of a system that did not meet the requirements of the 2006 International Mechanical Code for provision of outside air ventilation. As a result, the building had ongoing temperature and humidity control problems. The existing fire sprinkler system was also not in compliance with current National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards.

The scope of work would consist of removal of the existing fan coil units, installation a new ducted HVAC system of variable air volume units, new air handling units, associated pumps and electrical equipment. Significant structural framing and support work would be needed in the attic to accommodate the new mechanical equipment. The steam and chilled water pipes that served Davis College were also in poor condition and would be replaced. Sprinkler system piping and sprinkler heads would be replaced throughout the building. Fire alarm components would be replaced as needed for proper tie-in to the building fire alarm system. Painting and carpet replacement were required architectural finish upgrades which would support the primary scope.

The anticipated budget for the project was \$2,100,000 with construction to be completed by December 2011. Approval was being requested to fund the remainder of the design and construction.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to fund Phase II design and construction for a total project budget of \$2,100,000 to be funded with Institutional Funds. Mr. Adams so moved and Mr. Lister seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

B. Spigner House Renovation: The Spigner House is a former private home and marks the eastern boundary of the University. Acquired by the University in 1963, it

previously served as administrative offices for Telecommunications Instruction and Independent Learning. The building contains approximately 9,500 gross square feet and is on the historic register.

This project was approved for Phase I Design in December 2009. Renovation involved installation of a fire suppression system and an upgrade of water supply piping serving the house; replacement of mechanical system with central air conditioning; creation of new first floor ADA compliant restrooms and replacement of all plumbing fixtures; upgrade of electrical including new panels, branch circuitry, power, data, lighting, and fire alarm systems; asbestos and lead paint abatement; seismic retrofit; structural reinforcement of the first floor; installation of historically appropriate, energy efficient replacement windows; creation of a catering prep space; and restoration of interior finishes including hardwood floor refinishing, plaster repair and repainting.

The first floor would be renovated to provide space for business use suited for seminar classroom and conference space to accommodate 60-80 personnel. Additional restrooms to meet code compliance and a break room would also be included in the renovation. The second floor would be renovated to create a reception area and offices for Sodexo. The renovation would include modest reconfiguration of existing walls, new finishes and installation of plumbing fixtures.

The exterior of the house had been maintained and was in good condition. The existing wood windows would remain with minor repairs anticipated. The house was currently heated by a boiler and radiators and cooled by window unit air conditioners. The electrical systems and fire alarm system were completely outdated. The renovation would include updates to the electrical and mechanical systems. A new HVAC system would be installed. New electrical service would be supplied to the building, and all branch circuitry, raceways, fixtures and receptacles would be replaced.

The anticipated budget for the project was \$1,000,000 with construction to be completed by December 2011. Approval was being requested to fund the remainder of the design and construction.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to fund Phase II design and construction for a total project budget of \$1,000,000 to be funded through the auxiliary food service account. Mr. Loadholt so moved and Mr. Hubbard seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

C. Sumter Street Safety Improvements: This project was approved for Phase I Design in October 2008. The original scope was to improve campus safety on South Sumter Street from Rocky Branch Creek to Whaley Street. This scope was expanded to include the portion of Sumter Street from Rocky Branch Creek to Blossom. Improvements were to include removing on-road parking, narrowing of traffic lanes,

installation of pedestrian scale street lighting, creation of landscaped tree zones and the installation of new walkways where required. Other improvements were to include landscaping, irrigation, improvement of service areas and service access.

During Phase I design, the scope of the project was revised to match projected available funding. The project revision would improve the safety of the campus by addressing the hazardous situation on Sumter Street where pedestrians crossed over Rocky Branch Creek. This area of campus was prone to flooding during storm events. There were no connecting sidewalks or permanent bridge structures to cross over Rocky Branch Creek; this forced students to walk in the street. Improvements included the construction of a pedestrian/bicycle bridge, sidewalks connecting the bridge to the Band/Dance Facility and the Blatt PE Recreation Field, additional street lighting, stream bank protection and erosion control, water quality components and street trees. This project was contingent upon permitting from Norfolk Southern and the Army Corp of Engineers. The scope revision allowed the project to remain within the original cost estimate.

The anticipated budget for this project was \$1,000,000 with construction to be completed by December 2011. Approval was being requested to rename and re-scope the original project and to fund the remainder of the design and construction.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to rename and re-scope the original project and to fund Phase II design and construction for a total project budget of \$1,000,000 to be funded with Institutional Funds. Mr. Adams so moved and Mr. Warr seconded the motion.

Chairman Buyck noted that the USC Design Review Board made some suggestion regarding this project, which had been taken into consideration.

Ms. Moody asked if any partnerships with the City of Columbia had been considered for this project. Mr. Quasney stated that the City owned the road and that USC could approach the City about helping with the road improvements; but that the City may not be inclined to help with projects on the USC Campus, when they are trying to address projects elsewhere, especially on Main Street. Ms. Moody asked if there were any grants available with the City for "streetscaping" projects. Mr. Quasney responded that his staff had not found any, but would look into it again.

The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

D. Woodrow College Window Upgrades and Life Safety Improvements:

Woodrow College, constructed in 1914, is a 34,000 square foot residence hall located on the second tier of the Horseshoe and directly across from the Russell House. This project was approved for Phase I design in October 2008. The scope would improve the south façade of Woodrow College and replace the existing windows. Façade improvements would include enclosing the existing open emergency stairs on the south side of the building. Additionally, approximately 168 windows would be replaced or restored with new

energy efficient windows, and upgrades would include replacement of window sills damaged by water infiltration. The anticipated budget for the project was \$2.1 million to be funded with Housing Funds. The work would be completed in phases with improvements and upgrades taking place in the summer months of 2011 and 2012.

During Phase I design, the scope of the project was revised to include installation of a new comprehensive fire suppression system. The revisions included façade improvements by removing the existing exterior metal stairwells, no longer required when the fire suppression system was installed. These building code required stairs were also showing significant deterioration at the building shell connections. If not removed, as allowed by fire code with the fire suppression installed, it would cost a significant amount of funding to simply keep them securely attached to Woodrow as well as other facilities.

Over the summer of 2011, the building would have its existing wet sprinkler system removed and replaced with a new wet pipe system on floors 1 through 3. Improvements to the existing stairwells included the installation of new handrails. New entry doors would be installed to all living units. All windows and exterior doors on the north, east and west facades of the building would be removed and replaced.

Over the summer of 2012, the building would have its existing dry sprinkler system in the attic and basement removed and replaced with a new dry pipe system. Exterior metal stairwells on the south façade would be removed. All windows and exterior doors on the south façade of the building would be removed and replaced. ADA access improvements would also be accomplished on the south exterior entry of the building.

The total anticipated budget for the project would remain at \$2,100,000 with total construction to be completed by August 2012. Approval was being requested to rename and re-scope the original project and to fund the remainder of the design and construction.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to rename and re-scope the original project and to fund Phase II design and construction for a total project budget of \$2,100,000 to be funded with Housing Maintenance Reserve Funds. Mr. Adams so moved and Mr. Warr seconded the motion.

Mr. Jones asked if it would be a good idea to identify for the Committee "Life Safety" projects in a separate list, as opposed to renovations. Mr. Quasney said that he would do so.

The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

E. McClintock/Wade Hampton Fire Protection Upgrades: This project was originally approved as McClintock Renovation and Fire Protection in October 2008 for Phase I. The scope was to modernize the facility and perform life safety upgrades. Renovations included repairs to interior walls, restoration of the lobby, and installation of new

finishes including paint, carpet and tile. Building systems (plumbing, electrical, and mechanical rooms) were also to be upgraded. Life safety upgrades included emergency lighting, and the installation of a new fire protection sprinkler system and fire alarms.

During the Phase I design, the University deemed fire protection upgrades for student housing as one of its highest priorities for student safety. The two remaining facilities in the Women's Quad requiring fire protection upgrades were the residence halls of McClintock and Wade Hampton. Life safety upgrades were needed to meet current code requirements and to protect the safety of students housed in the facilities. The upgrades in McClintock would perform life safety upgrades including emergency lighting, installation of a new fire protection sprinkler system and fire alarms. The upgrades in Wade Hampton would include the installation and renovation of the fire suppression system, fire alarm, and emergency lighting. The fire and life safety protection upgrade estimate for McClintock was \$546,000 and for Wade Hampton was \$954,000.

The total anticipated budget for the project was \$1,500,000 with construction to be completed by August 2011. Approval was being requested to rename and re-scope the original project and to fund the remainder of the design and construction. Mr. Quasney noted that once this project was completed, 98 percent of the University's undergraduate residence halls will have sprinkler systems.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to rename and re-scope the project and fund Phase II design and construction with a budget of \$1,500,000 funded with Housing Maintenance Reserve Funds. Mr. Loadholt so moved and Mr. Adams seconded the motion.

The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

F. Colonial Life Arena Basketball Locker Room Renovations: This project was approved for Phase I design in February 2010. The project would renovate the men's and women's basketball locker room areas in the Colonial Life Arena, so that these facilities were competitive with other institutions in the SEC and ACC with whom USC competed for recruits.

The project would completely reconfigure the existing locker areas in the Arena to create a reception lobby, enhance and combine film and lounge areas, and relocate and enhance locker rooms for both men's and women's teams. The special event locker room would also be relocated. Renovations would include new finishes and furnishings to upgrade the overall appearance of the facilities.

The anticipated budget for the project was \$1,000,000 with construction to be completed by the end of October 2011. Approval was being requested to fund the remainder of the design and construction.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to fund Phase II design and construction for a total project budget of \$1,000,000 to be funded with Private Funds. Mr. Warr so moved and

Mr. Adams seconded the motion. Chairman Buyck congratulated Mr. Hyman for getting private funds for this project. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

G. Farmers Market Development Construction: Chairman Buyck stated that this item of business was temporarily withdrawn, and that there would be a called Buildings and Grounds Committee meeting to consider it.

III. Other Approvals:

A. Small Projects: Dr. Moore explained that the following approval requests were below \$500,000 in total project cost and therefore did not go through the State Phase I and II approval process. However, since they did exceed \$250,000 they did require Board of Trustee approval.

1. Whaley House Renovation: The USC Children's Law Center planned to relocate in the House within the next five years. Under the arrangement for consideration, the donor who owns the House would present it to the Historical Foundation, who would then take possession on it. It would be Historical Foundation property for up to a five year period. During that five year period the University would have a "call option" on the property.

Dr. Moore explained that the \$453,000 estimated cost of the project was basically a "call option" in that during the five years, fund raising would continue and could ultimately allow for the project to be paid for in total with private funds. The University's \$300,000 in Institutional Funds would be the maximum that the University could pay. If at the end of the five year period the University had not raised sufficient funds to do the complete renovation, the University would not exercise its "call option" on the property, and the property would then remain in the possession of the Historical Foundation for their disposition and future use.

The renovation consisted of structural repairs to seal the exterior envelope of both buildings, and to protect and maintain the property's integrity through roofing, gutters, turret sill repair, exterior carpentry repairs, awning removal, caulking, glazing, and painting.

The estimated cost for the project was \$453,000 and would be funded with \$300,000 in Institutional Funds and \$153,000 in Private Funds.

President Pastides emphasized that if at the end of the five year period the Children's Law Center was unable to raise the needed funding, the University would not go through with the project. He noted, however, that he was optimistic the Children's Law Center's Director Harry Davis would be success in his fund raising efforts.

Mr. Whittle asked what it would cost to properly upfit the Whaley House and Mr. Davis responded approximately \$900,000. That figure did not include the \$450,000 for exterior renovations.

Dr. Floyd expressed his concern that the University was setting itself up to acquire a "tremendous liability;" and that the Board should look at the house very closely first. Mr. Warr said that he had the same reservations about the project as Dr. Floyd did.

Ms. Moody concluded that she felt the project should be considered further, before any action on it.

Mr. Davis clarified that the Children's Law Center fund raising efforts would not compete with the fund raising efforts for a new Law School.

Mr. Whittle asked where the Center was currently located and Mr. Davis said that part of the staff of 20 were located on the fifth floor of 1600 Hampton and in rented space across the street.

Dr. Floyd suggested that the University let the Historical Foundation raise the funds, do the renovations, and own the building; then the Children's Law Center could lease the space from them, without the liability.

Mr. Jones asked how this project was "prioritized" with pending life safety issues and other needed projects on the campus.

Mr. Davis stated that the property on Gervais Street (approximately 1.15 acres) was appraised at \$2.4 million dollars as is, two years ago.

Mr. Hubbard said that he felt that the project had been thought through as carefully as any project brought before the Buildings and Grounds Committee, and that for a \$300,000 investment he was confident that the funds would be raised and the facility would be well used and would enhance the University's Law School, as well as delivery of legal services for the children of South Carolina. He concluded that he strongly supported the project.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to approve the Whaley House Renovations project with a budget of \$453,000 in Institutional and Private Funds. Mr. Hubbard so moved and Mr. Gregory seconded the motion. The vote was taken and although not unanimous, the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

2. 1200 Catawba Street Renovation: This project would provide the first integrated and distinct biomedical engineering research laboratory space in the College of Engineering and Computing. There was 1,600 square feet of space, formerly used as offices in the Catawba Street Annex, to be retrofitted to wet labs/bio labs for the Biomedical Engineering program. The renovations would provide space for three faculty members in Biomedical Engineering and four Biosafety Level II (BSL II) areas for tissue biofabrication and cell culture in the Catawba Street Annex. In addition, funds would provide workspace for approximately a dozen graduate students and post-doctoral researchers. The modifications would include a restroom and other accommodations to

meet ADA requirements.

Nearly half of the funding for the project would be provided by a grant from the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The grant, entitled SC IDeA Network of Biomedical Research Excellence (INBRE), has received approval from NIH and includes \$225,000 for this Alterations and Renovations (A&R) project. An additional \$270,000 would be provided by the College of Engineering and Computing (CEC).

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to approve the project with a budget of \$495,000 to be funded with \$225,000 from an NIH Grant Funds, and \$270,000 from College of Engineering and Computing Operating Funds. Mr. Lister so moved and Mr. Loadholt seconded the motion.

The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

3. USC Aiken Fire Protection and Alarm System Upgrades:

This project began as an internal project with a budget of \$145,000 to provide fire protection upgrades in the Business and Education building, the Sciences Building, the Penland Building and the H&SS buildings on the USC Aiken campus. The problems identified with existing systems are false alarms and most of the equipment is no longer supported by the manufacturer.

USC Aiken requested to increase the budget for this project from \$145,000 to \$445,000. This \$300,000 increase would come from year two ARRA Federal Stimulus Funds. Approximately \$200,000 of this was due to an increased allocation in funding above the year one level. The remaining \$100,000 was from prioritizing this life-safety project above cosmetic building renovations that were originally planned.

The budget for the project was \$445,000 and would be funded with ARRA Federal Stimulus Funds.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to approve the USC Aiken Fire Protection and Alarm System Upgrades, with a budget of \$445,000 in ARRA Federal Stimulus Funds. Mr. Loadholt so moved and Mr. Lister seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

B. Columbia Campus Life Safety Upgrades: This project is for the continuation of fire protection projects across campus, which have been deemed priorities by Environmental Health and Safety (EHS-Fire Safety). The next identified priorities are the Humanities Office/Classroom and Byrnes Buildings. The buildings are currently outfitted with obsolete fire detection and alarm systems that are no longer supported by the manufacturers. These projects would replace the obsolete systems with addressable

fire alarm systems capable of future expansion rather than replacement. The projects require approval by the Board of Trustees.

1. Humanities Office/Classroom Fire Protection Upgrades:

The Humanities Office/Classroom buildings have an obsolete Gamewell system that is no longer supported by the manufacturer. This project would replace the obsolete system with an upgraded, addressable fire alarm system.

The budget for the project was \$369,000 and would be funded with Institutional Capital Planning Funds.

2. James F. Byrnes Fire Protection Upgrades: The Byrnes building

has an obsolete Johnson Controls system that is no longer supported by the manufacturer. This project would replace the obsolete system with an upgraded, addressable fire alarm system.

The budget for the project is \$297,000 and is to be funded with Institutional Capital Planning Funds.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to approve these two fire alarm projects with budgets and funding sources as listed:

Humanities Office/Classroom Fire Protection Upgrades	\$369,000	ICPF
James F. Byrnes Fire Protection Upgrades	\$297,000	ICPF

Mr. Jones so moved and Mr. Hubbard seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

C. Scope Changes:

1. Abate Jones PSC North; Increase in Scope: The project was approved to address the remediation of existing asbestos (above the ceiling) in approximately 70,000 square feet of the Jones Physical Sciences Building, including work in the north wing and the basement of both the north and south wing.

When bids for the project were received, they were significantly lower than the construction estimate. Funds are available to revise the scope of the project to include the replacement of the fire alarm systems on floors 1-3 south side, the entire north side, and the basement. Replacement of systems on floors 5-7 on the south side of the building, were included in a previous project. The upgrade was needed to permit interface with the system installed on floors 5-7 south side and would provide the smoke detection and voice evacuation capabilities required by code.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to revise the scope to include fire protection. This will result in no change in the budget. Mr. Jones so moved and Mr. Hubbard seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

2. USC Upstate Security System Upgrades & University Police Building:

This project was approved in December 2009 with a budget of \$350,000 funded with federal stimulus funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Grant. The project was to renovate an existing building on campus to provide adequate facilities for University Police to effectively perform their required campus services which include security, safety, dispatching, surveillance, parking management, student identification system and other duties.

It was initially planned to renovate the facility retaining the existing walls and building systems. As design of the renovations progressed and the detailed programmatic requirements of the police department were developed, it was determined that the most cost effective way to meet these needs was to totally renovate the interior. This would include reconfiguration of the existing space and replacement of the building systems. The increased scope would require an increase in the project budget, funded with the reallocation of available stimulus funding.

In an effort to keep the project within the limits of available funding, the scope of the project was revised to delete parking lot improvements, exterior security fencing, facade improvements, and other items not directly related to providing a fully functional police station.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to increase the project budget to \$490,000 to be funded with American Recover and Reinvestment Act Grant. Ms. Moody so moved and Mr. Jones seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

3. USC Sumter Deferred Maintenance: A project to address various deferred maintenance items on the USC Sumter campus was funded with State Funds and was approved in August 2005. The work included in the original project scope has been completed. This included replacement of HVAC controls and pneumatic valves in the Student Union Building, upgrade fire alarm system in campus buildings by replacing building-to-building connectivity with fiber network connections, and interior painting of the common areas in the Nettles Building. Also included were sidewalk and accessibility improvements to the campus, replacing uneven walks and tripping hazards, and adding permanent ramps to the Science and Business Administration Buildings.

The remaining funds are to be utilized to renovate the restrooms on the first floor of the Administration Building. Additional private funding has been identified to augment the existing funding for this project.

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to increase the existing budget by \$50,000 funded with Private Funds. This will result in a total project budget of \$300,000 funded with \$250,000 in State Funds and \$50,000 in Private Funds. Mr. Loadholt so moved and Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

The University hereby declares its official intent, pursuant to Federal Regulations, to reimburse itself from the amount of proceeds of the tax-exempt bond issue.

IV. Report for Information:

A. Energy Efficient Stimulus Funding Projects Status Report: USC Columbia was allocated \$2,809,219 of federal stimulus funds through the South Carolina Energy Office for energy efficient projects. In April 2010, the Board authorized the Administration to utilize the funding to accomplish the implementation of the projects in priority order, progressing as far toward completion of all projects as final contract bid prices permit. The following projects were in various stages of implementation and all were expected to be completed by November 2010.

1. Energy Performance Web Based Education Program & Educational Website
2. N Computing virtual computer terminals
3. Plate Frame Heat Exchange at North Energy Plant
4. Install Central Chilled Water Air Separators at Plants
5. Upgrade Existing EMS Controls and Install Meters
6. Retrofit Lab Fume Hoods
7. Install Lighting Controls and Sensors
8. Add Variable Speed Drives on Water Pumps at Plants
9. Retrofit Parking Garages with LED
10. Solar Demonstration Project
11. Consultant and Technical Evaluations

Chairman Buyck thanked Mr. Quasney and congratulated him and his staff for the detailed quality of his project presentations. Mr. Quasney accepted the thanks on behalf of his team.

Mr. Jones asked where the University stood with the Bio-Mass Plant and Dr. Moore stated that it was a contractual matter that was a work in progress and asked if he could discuss it at another time. Mr. Jones agreed.

Mr. Jones asked for a status of corrective action for the hole in the Law School roof. Mr. Quasney explained that they were moving forward through the State procurement process as quickly as provided and anticipated that a contractor would be on board within the next few weeks, and the project completed by the end of November.

Mr. Hubbard said that he recalled that the Committee designated all "roof repairs" as "emergency" projects and since this particular project was designated an emergency in April 2010, why in September 2010, was it still not corrected? Mr. Quasney explained they had made it a priority, but a designer had to be hired, the project had to be designed, and then the project had to be bid.

Much discussion ensued regarding the process of emergency projects.

Mr. Gregory asked that with regard to the upcoming Higher Education Summit, a chief concern was that one reason for higher tuition rates was capital projects. He asked if staff could extrapolate, over the last ten year, how much tuition went toward capital projects and debt payments. Dr. Moore responded that he and his staff were currently preparing such a report for the summit and that given the opportunity they would present

it. If however, they were not given the opportunity to present the information there, they would disseminate it through media before the Summit.

More discussion was held regarding the upcoming Summit and the University's preparation of materials related to the Summit. Dr. Moore noted that the Board would receive additional information, prior to the Summit.

B. Sale of Gamecock Properties Status Report: Chairman Buyck recognized Mr. Tallant, who updated the Committee on the six Gamecock properties he discussed at the Committee's April 23, 2010 meeting. He said based on appraisal information on hand, he recommend that they continue to hold on to the properties until the real estate market improved.

President Pastides asked if it cost the University to hold on to the properties for another year and Mr. Tallant responded the only cost was basic landscape maintenance.

C. Safety Updates: Dr. Moore asked that in consideration of time to defer an update on the three safety projects, and there were no objections.

1. Housing Sprinkler Report Update:
2. Carolina Alert - Emergency Website:
3. Lightning Prediction System:

V. Other Business:

A. SCANA Property: Presentation of this item was deferred.

B. Monticello Road Property: Dr. Moore stated that the Board of Trustees had approved disposing of this property, located at Monticello Road and Blue Ridge Terrace, in November 2004. The State Budget and Control Board had approved this property to be auctioned and that process was moving forward. The University asked that it be sold at the best possible price the State auction brought.

C. USC Columbia Master Plan: Presentation of this item was deferred.

D. Housing District Plan: Dr. Moore stated that he was working with Dr. Pruitt to prepare for solicitation by RFP for a Housing District (Master) Plan to provide the 10-15 year framework for overall enhancement of student housing at USC. which may include new and/or renovated housing and some building demolition.

E. Project Approval Authority Increase: Presentation of this item of business was deferred.

VI. Gift Naming Opportunities:

Chairman Buyck called on Secretary Stepp, who explained that the following Gift Naming Opportunities were presented in Executive Session without objection:

A. Department of Athletics:

"The Juk, McEntire & Sweatman Study Lounge"

B. University Libraries:

"The Hemrick N. Salley Family Alcove" and  
"The Hemrick N. Salley Family Endowment Fund"

C. School of Law:

1. "The Harold and Martha Breibart Study Area"
2. "The C. Ben Garren, Jr. Faculty Office"
3. "The McNair Law Firm Dean's Administrative Suite"
4. "The Tuck B. Rion Jr. Reference Collection Area"
5. "The Mortimer M. Weinberg, Jr. Clinic Director's Office"
6. "The Ellis, Lawhorne & Sims, P.A. Outdoor Event Space Patio"

Chairman Buyck called for a motion to approve the gift naming opportunities as presented. Mr. Adams so moved and Ms. Moody seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

VII. Development Foundation Report:

Chairman Buyck called on Mr. Meekins who provided an update on Adesso, the South Main Street Condominium Project. Out of 110 units, they had sold 74. In response to questions from Mr. Whittle, Mr. Meekins explained that both the Foundation and Holder Properties, their investment partner, would lose their equity in the project, approximately \$4 million dollars; due to the price reductions on the units.

The Foundation was in the process of demolishing the old duplexes in Wheeler Hill and continued to enjoy a good relationship with Wheeler Hill neighborhood.

The Inn at USC continued to be a "star in the University's crown." The Inn continued to receive stellar feedback from guests.

There being no other business, Chairman Buyck declared the meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Stepp  
Secretary