The October 2019 Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) performance audit found that ABOR lacked comprehensive property information and guidance to implement its real estate policies, and the operation of some ABOR property lacked oversight and accountability. ABOR’s status in implementing the recommendations is as follows:

**Status of 17 recommendations**

| Implemented | 3 |
| Partially implemented | 1 |
| Implementation in process | 5 |
| Not implemented | 8 |

We will conduct a 36-month followup with ABOR on the status of the recommendations that have not yet been implemented.

**Finding 1: ABOR’s lack of written guidance for implementing its real estate policies and approving commercial subleases increases the risk of inappropriate use of public resources leased to private parties**

1. ABOR should develop and implement written guidance for the universities to follow regarding commercial lease agreements that:

   a. Requires each agreement to include measurable performance standards related to its policy objective for entering the agreement and a process through which ABOR may take action if a private entity receiving a benefit through an agreement does not meet the performance standards.

      **Implementation in process**—As reported in the initial followup, ABOR revised its commercial leasing policy to require master lease agreements to include measurable performance standards and a lease remedy should the established performance standards not be met and developed guidance for the universities requiring them to describe how the performance standards align with the objective for entering into the agreement. However, as of October 2021, ABOR had not approved a new commercial lease agreement under the revised policy requirements. Therefore, we will assess ABOR’s and the universities’ implementation of and compliance with ABOR’s revised policy and the universities’ use of the guidance in a future followup after ABOR approves a commercial lease agreement.

   b. Outlines a process for complying with ABOR’s policy requirement to document the proposed lease agreement’s economic benefits, tax treatment of the real property and proposed improvements and its impact on other taxing jurisdictions, and how it furthers the university’s institutional mission, including:

      • An assessment of how the proposal aligns with ABOR’s objectives for such agreements.
      • A comparison of the costs and benefits of the proposed agreement that identifies its financial and nonfinancial costs and benefits.
      • An assessment of the proposal’s impact on the tax base and potential tax revenue for other taxing jurisdictions.
      • An explanation of any assumptions used in the evaluation, such as those used to develop estimates of indirect economic benefits and the limitations of the results standards.
Implementation in process—As reported in the initial followup, ABOR developed guidance for the universities on documenting how the proposed lease agreement aligns with ABOR’s objective for entering commercial lease agreements, its economic costs and benefits to the university and the State, and its tax treatment and potential impact on other taxing jurisdictions. The guidance also includes instructions for the universities to report the assumptions and methodology used for each of these items. As of October 2021, ABOR had not approved a new commercial lease agreement under the revised policy requirements. Therefore, we will assess ABOR’s and the universities’ implementation of and compliance with ABOR’s revised policy and the universities’ use of the guidance in a future followup after ABOR approves a commercial lease agreement.

c. Requires that each agreement receiving a tax benefit be periodically evaluated, on a schedule determined by ABOR’s need for updated information and the evaluator’s capacity, to ensure the private entity receiving the benefit is meeting the agreement’s performance standards and to determine the agreement’s actual benefits and costs.

Not implemented—ABOR has not made further progress toward implementing this recommendation since the initial followup. Specifically, as reported in the initial followup, ABOR revised its commercial leasing policy and developed related guidance to require the universities to annually report on the performance standards included in their commercial lease agreements, including financial and nonfinancial benefits to the university. ABOR also indicated that it would use these reports to track and monitor ongoing approval and reporting requirements (see Recommendation 4), require its designees to provide periodic reports detailing the fulfillment of their oversight duties (see Recommendation 7), and track and act on its oversight responsibilities prescribed in master lease agreements (see Recommendation 10). However, although ABOR reported that it would require the universities to submit these reports to it in September of each year, it did not require the universities to do so in September 2021. According to ABOR, it delayed the report submission requirement to determine whether it could include the reports as part of a web-based portal it has been developing for accessing information on the universities’ property listings (see Recommendation 13). ABOR reported it decided to keep the reports separate from the web-based portal and that the universities would provide these reports to it by the end of calendar year 2021. Because ABOR did not receive these reports before we completed our 24-month follow-up work, we will further assess ABOR’s implementation of this recommendation during the 36-month followup.

2. ABOR should develop and implement criteria on the appropriate use of the real estate policy requirement waiver and written guidance for the universities on how they should document justification for policy waiver requests.

Not implemented—ABOR has not made further progress toward implementing this recommendation since the initial followup. Although ABOR developed guidance requiring the universities to justify any policy waiver requests related to commercial lease proposals based on the criteria that the waiver be in the best interest of the university and that it complies with applicable State laws, this guidance applies only to waiver requests for commercial lease agreements. Additionally, ABOR reported that it is performing a comprehensive review and rewrite of its capital planning and development policies, which will include criteria on the appropriate use of the real estate policy requirement waiver, and expects to complete a draft of the policy revisions by February 2022.

3. ABOR should develop and implement written guidance for the universities on how to determine fair market rental value for property it leases.

Not implemented—ABOR has not developed guidance on how universities should determine fair market rental value for property it leases. Instead, ABOR’s revised commercial leasing policy requires the universities to submit to it the valuation methodology for any proposed lease agreement, including any assumptions used, as part of the final lease approval process. However, without providing guidance that identifies appropriate methodologies, ABOR is at risk of receiving inconsistent information from the universities that does not allow it to assess whether the rental rate is set at fair market rental value.

4. ABOR should develop and implement a process to track and monitor ongoing approval and reporting requirements to help ensure the universities comply with the requirements.

Not implemented—ABOR has not made further progress toward implementing this recommendation since the initial followup (see explanation for Recommendation 1c).
5. ABOR should develop and implement written guidance similar to its leasing policy requirements for commercial leases that its designees should follow when approving commercial development sublease agreements under its master lease agreements.

**Implementation in process**—As reported in the initial followup, ABOR revised its commercial leasing policy to require the universities to identify in any new commercial master lease agreements the process and requirements for tenants to enter into sublease agreements and developed guidance for its designees. However, ABOR’s guidance does not require its designees to consider other requirements similar to those that ABOR considers for commercial leases, such as the anticipated tax impact on other taxing jurisdictions or expected economic financial and nonfinancial benefits and costs. ABOR reported that it does not plan to develop additional guidance for commercial development sublease agreements because it reviews and approves master lease agreements, which are subject to its leasing policy requirements for commercial leases. As a result, ABOR reported that it believes the requirement to ensure that sublease agreements align with master lease agreement objectives is sufficient for ensuring appropriate governance of its property. As of October 2021, ABOR had not yet reviewed a new commercial master lease agreement subject to this policy requirement and guidance. Therefore, we will assess ABOR’s and the universities’ implementation of and compliance with the revised policy and guidance during a future followup after ABOR has reviewed and approved a commercial master lease.

6. ABOR should review existing master lease agreements and determine if they can be amended to include approval requirements that are consistent with its new guidance on master lease agreements and amend them accordingly.

**Not implemented**—As explained in Recommendation 5, ABOR developed guidance that its designees should follow when approving commercial development sublease agreements. ABOR reported that it did not have a specific time frame for amending its existing master lease agreements to align with its new guidance, but it plans to work with the universities to determine the optimal time frame to amend its existing master lease agreements.

Finding 2: Operation of some ABOR property has lacked oversight and accountability, resulting in inappropriate use of proceeds and limited transparency

7. ABOR should develop and implement a process to help ensure its designees fulfill the oversight duties delegated to them, such as conducting periodic monitoring or requiring designees to provide periodic reports or documentation detailing the fulfillment of their oversight duties.

**Not implemented**—ABOR has not made further progress toward implementing this recommendation since the initial followup (see explanation for Recommendation 1c).

8. ABOR should develop and implement policies that prohibit a university president and/or their designee who has been delegated oversight responsibilities for any real estate agreement with a third party from also participating in governance and/or operational responsibilities related to that third party.

**Partially implemented at 12 months**—ABOR revised its commercial leasing policy to prohibit its designees from participating in governance responsibilities of a university-affiliated entity while at the same time fulfilling their ABOR delegated responsibilities related to any new master lease with an affiliated entity. Additionally, ABOR amended its existing master lease agreements with the Campus Research Corporation (CRC) to prohibit its designee from serving as a CRC Board member. However, ABOR has not similarly amended its other existing master lease agreement with ASU Research Park, Inc (ASURP). ABOR reported that it did not have a specific time frame for amending its existing ASURP master lease agreement to align with its revised policy, but it plans to work with Arizona State University to determine the optimal time frame to amend the master lease agreement.

9. ABOR should work with its legal counsel to determine whether any actions should be taken to address the improper advances from the Rita Road property to the Bridges property.

**Implemented at 12 months**—During the audit, we found that the CRC had improperly advanced approximately $3.9 million in proceeds generated from the Rita Road property for expenses at the Bridges property. ABOR determined to not take any action to address the prior improper advances. However, ABOR amended its 3 master
lease agreements with the CRC to authorize the CRC to use revenues received from managing any ABOR property to manage and/or develop any other property the CRC leases from ABOR. As a result, as of July 2020, the CRC is authorized to advance future proceeds between the Rita Road property and the Bridges property.

10. ABOR should develop and implement procedures to track and act on its oversight responsibilities prescribed in master lease agreements, such as ensuring it receives and appropriately reviews annual reports if the CRC does not provide them in accordance with master lease agreements.

   Not implemented—ABOR has not made further progress toward implementing this recommendation since the initial followup (see explanation for Recommendation 1c).

11. ABOR should ensure its legal counsel works with the universities to review their classification of public records in accordance with public records laws.

   Implemented at 12 months—ABOR’s legal counsel and legal counsels from each of the 3 universities have established a work group that meets as needed to review classification of public records across the university system.

12. ABOR should comply with public records laws by maintaining records that are reasonably necessary to provide an accurate accounting of its official activities, such as those described in its master lease agreements.

   Implemented at 24 months—As of October 2021, ABOR maintained as a public record the CRC’s fiscal year 2022 budget. Additionally, as reported in the 12-month followup, ABOR amended its 3 master lease agreements with the CRC to no longer require it to provide subleases to ABOR’s designee for review and approval. Instead, the amended master lease agreements state that ABOR’s designee will review and approve a document that includes the basic terms and conditions (term sheet) for each of the CRC’s proposed subleases. According to ABOR, the CRC provided 15 term sheets to its designee for review and approval between June 2020 and October 2021. ABOR maintained these 15 term sheets as public records.

Finding 3: ABOR lacks comprehensive property information to independently oversee and manage the use of its property

13. ABOR should develop and implement policies and/or written guidance for developing and regularly updating property listings, including clearly identifying the property information that should be maintained in the listings, such as parcel numbers, description of the property, location, use restrictions, and current and planned uses.

   Implementation in process—During a May 2021 public meeting of ABOR’s finance, capital, and resources committee, ABOR staff reported they have begun developing a web-based portal that will allow them to access property listings and related information that is maintained in geospatial information systems (GIS) databases by all 3 universities. ABOR staff estimated the portal will be completed by the end of calendar year 2021. However, ABOR did not indicate whether it has revised its policies and/or developed written guidance for how to update and maintain property listings using the portal and the universities’ GIS databases. We will assess ABOR’s development and implementation of the portal and any related policies and/or written guidance during a future followup.

14. ABOR should continue with its efforts to develop a complete and accurate property listing of all ABOR properties using information compiled by the universities, containing all land and improvements, with sufficient information to allow it to oversee the universities’ use of its property, including unique property identification, location, use restrictions, and current and planned use.

   Implementation in process—As explained in Recommendation 13, ABOR staff reported in a public meeting of ABOR’s finance, capital, and resources committee that they have begun developing a web-based portal that will allow them to access property listings and related information maintained in GIS databases by all 3 universities.
15. ABOR should develop and implement procedures to verify property ownership and the accuracy of information in the property listings, such as working with the county assessors’ and recorders’ offices to verify property ownership. These procedures could include a risk-based approach and sampling methods for performing this verification work, as appropriate.

Not implemented—ABOR reported that the GIS databases will include information regarding property ownership documentation that will allow ABOR to confirm the universities have this documentation for all property. However, ABOR did not provide documentation demonstrating it has developed and implemented procedures for verifying the property ownership and accuracy of other property information maintained in GIS databases by all 3 universities that it plans to use to oversee its property (see explanation for Recommendation 13 for more information).