

---

**Capital Budget Committee**

---

**HB 2151**

**Brief Description:** Prioritizing proposed higher education capital projects.

**Sponsors:** Representatives Alexander, Dunshee, Sommers, Cox and Sehlin.

**Brief Summary of Bill**

- Declares an intent that a methodology be developed that will guide capital appropriation decisions by rating and individually ranking all major capital projects proposed by the two-year and four-year public universities and colleges.

**Hearing Date:** 3/3/03

**Staff:** Marziah Kiehn-Sanford (786-7349).

**Background:**

The state adopts a biennial capital budget each odd-numbered year, appropriating moneys for a variety of capital projects and programs. In preparation for this budget, state agencies and higher education institutions prepare and submit budget requests to the Governor's Office. The Governor then submits a budget request to the legislature shortly before the legislative session.

A significant portion of capital budget appropriations goes to higher education institutions. There are six four-year institutions: The University of Washington; Washington State University; Central Washington University; Eastern Washington University; The Evergreen State College; and Western Washington University. These institutions are governed by regents or trustees, who have a significant amount of autonomy in the governance of their institutions. The 34 community and technical colleges are governed by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges. Each of the six four-year institutions and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges provide capital budget requests for each biennium to the Governor's Office and the legislature.

Capital budget appropriations for higher education institutions typically fall into one of three categories: providing access for students; facility preservation and renovation; and institutional mission. A recent study by the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee found there is a significant backlog of facility infrastructure projects throughout higher

education institutions. The report of the 2002 Capital Budget Interim Workgroup on Higher Education Facilities recommended that for the 2003-05 biennium priority be given to: 1) critical preservation projects at all institutions and 2) to providing access at the community and technical colleges. Preservation/renovation projects that were necessary for program suitability and mission at all institutions were also highlighted by the workgroup.

The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) provides a ranking of projects by category. Projects within a category such as preservation are not prioritized by the HECB, but listed alphabetically by institution and then by institutional priority. This list includes the community and technical colleges as well as the four-year institutions. The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges ranks all its recommended projects in priority order based on criteria it developed with the 34 community and technical colleges.

**Summary of Bill:**

Beginning with the 2005-07 biennium, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) prepares, in consultation with the four-year institutions, a prioritized list of major projects proposed by these institutions. The HECB must combine this list with the list prepared by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges into one list ranking all the higher education proposed projects. The HECB submits this list as its budget recommendation.

For ranking repairs and renovations to existing systems, consideration must be given to the age and condition of buildings, program suitability of the facility, and the utilization of the facility. For ranking new facilities, consideration must be given to existing capacity, space utilization levels, and projected enrollment and staffing. Minor works projects can be ranked as one project.

In developing the rating/ranking of projects, the HECB must be provided with available information by higher education institutions, the Office of Financial Management, and the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee. The board may also use independent service providers.

**Appropriation:** None.

**Fiscal Note:** Requested on 2/27/2003.

**Effective Date:** The bill takes effect 90 days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.