FS Q2 ACHIEVEMENTS

BUILDING SERVICES (BSD)

• Recycling launched an online application to replace wheels which is estimated to save 4,000 sheets of paper and more than 900 hours of work a year. This system also identified route efficiencies and allowed for a large data cleanup.

• Recycling collaborated with contracted vendor, Cedar Grove, to perform route audit to get updated food waste estimate to be used in waste diversion reporting (see measure).

• Collaborated with UW Sustainability and the Green Labs coordinator on LOI for CSF funding to pilot glove recycling in select locations on campus

TRANSPORTATION SERVICES (TS)

• Transportation Maintenance team developed a water reclamation system that collects, filters, and pumps water back into the pressure washer for reuse in parking facilities.

• Created a new short term permit stock to replace separate stock for 4 permit types, this streamlined the process for permit issuance, and improved cost-effective resources for the department.

STRATEGIC PLANNING & CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

• Launched a blog, Facebook page and Instagram account to better communicate with external audiences and partner with other units! uw.edu/facilities/blog

• Partnered with FABS-IT to create a governance structure for the website, specifically, the Web Governance Council, which will guide decisions and the direction of FS’ web presence.

FINANCE AND BUSINESS SERVICES (FABS)

• Major update for MSDA audit: Many materials have been added/eliminated from MyChem database. Additionally, the Stores part number was added to each item’s description which will make searching and reporting much easier and more consistent.

• Completed cross-training of FS Stores staff on the troubleshooting of the hand held scanner as well as manual entry of AiM Pick Tickets as a backup method if scanners fail.

• Considerable 5-S was completed in the annex rooms at Health Sciences Stores in combination with rearrangement of materials in the main Store to provide more efficient service to customers.

• Identified 54 conservation opportunities valued at $910,770 in total project cost with $261,174 annual utility savings and $230,195 utility rebate potential with a cumulative 2.6 year simple payback on the investment.

• Completed web infrastructure modernization planning. Facilitates professional/enterprise web development, testing, and production environment.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (UWEM)

• UWEM’s first Seismic Resilience Program Manager was hired to improve earthquake planning, preparedness and mitigation efforts on campus.

• Began offering FREE, customized Seismic Mitigation Walkthroughs to any UW office or classroom.

• Posted training video on Earthquake and Personal Disaster Preparedness accessible via the UWEM website – 24/7 training!

• Provided disaster and emergency training materials to 1,179 customers during the 2nd quarter and participated in a number of public outreach events.

FACILITIES EMPLOYEE SERVICES (FES)

• Established a quarterly All FS Administrative Support personnel meeting to discuss current issues, policies, and procedures.

• Scheduled Barb Brown to teach all online consolidated training sessions to improve information retention and training experience

• Added Introduction to FS Lean class to New Employee Orientation

• Completed first Stepping Stones for Success (BSD) three phase training series

• Hosted FS First Annual Employee Health & Wellness Fair at the FS Training Center for almost 200 FS employees
Facilities Services FY2016 Q2 BSC
Executive Summary

This month (February 2016) Facilities Services introduced Lean and the Balanced Scorecard to representatives from the University of California, Riverside. The two-day tour-de-force of our management systems covered the advances we have made over the years since implementing BSC and Lean. They visited over a dozen highly-functioning teams and saw evidence of progress through metrics and self-comparison. The tour ended with a panel of BSC measure owners who were told to answer any and all questions about the current state, its history, or their thoughts on its future – with complete honesty. The result? Genuine excitement and mass buy-in from all attendees.

The most important lesson learned by our guests was not that these systems are great when applied, but that the work is never done. You may recall that FY2016 saw the introduction of 10 new measures and the removal of seven others. In Q2, six of those measures are still in their design phase and two may have been scrapped entirely (building condition index and commute mode). This begs the question, are we truly embodying improving the work is the work if we let strategic improvements become obscured by other tasks? Consider this while reviewing the Q2 measures to follow.

In the Build Capacity quadrant, a new measure shows its baseline data (sans target). The Bring on the Bronze measure intends to draw attention to initiatives around the future application of Facilities Services to the Shingo Bronze prize – a lofty goal, yet an absolute indication of success. A longer standing measure of the FS-Wide Incident Rate met its target for the first time in two years, an accomplishment that was shared at the all-staff meeting earlier this month.

In the Customer quadrant, which was completely revamped in Q1, eight measures are all in need of attention. Absentee Rate, currently missing a target and initiatives, reveals large gaps in ready for business each day with an 84% full-staffing average for FS. In provide quality spaces and places, the measure of Buildings at APPA level 1 or 2 has a long history of baseline data and initiatives to close the gap, but has yet to see a steady pace of improvement as fluctuations in its data show no predictable forecast. The remaining three measures in enhance customer/stakeholder experience have yet to be defined and the same can be said for all three measures in be easy to do business with.

The Financial quadrant only saw one change in terms of the red/green scale as Direct Labor to Job Availability moved further away from its target and into the red. AiM Work Order Actual vs Estimate seems to be slipping further away from its target each successive quarter and deserves some special attention as a result. The remaining three measures continue with their successes and may possibly need new challenges (targets).

Lastly, in the Embrace Innovation quadrant, all measures remained red, yet subtler changes tell more of a story. Both Lean Participation, and Employee Idea Implementation saw their best performance on record with 44% participation and 1.07 ideas implemented per person. Water and Energy conservation saw increased usage of each utility, and thus moved further away from their respective targets. The Carbon Footprint measures are still missing data this quarter, but will be back-filled as soon as it is made available. Waste Diversion, a measure that is observed across UW, had some corrections made to its measurement that revealed a larger gap than expected – but forecasts remain optimistic. The diversion rate remains at 62%, the same as the previous quarter.

Facilities Services thanks you for your continued efforts in creating a world-class organization. We would also like to thank all of the customers and employees that participated in a recent focus group – the results of which will likely bring more changes, helping us to meet our goal of becoming a world-class institution.
FACILITIES SERVICES
SERVING TODAY, PRESERVING TOMORROW

OUR MISSION
We learn, adapt and innovate to preserve physical assets and deliver best services.

OUR VISION
A world-class organization providing exceptional service anywhere, anytime.

OUR STRATEGY

ENHANCE CUSTOMER/STAKEHOLDER EXPERIENCE
Deliver a campus ready for business each day
Provide quality spaces and places

BUILD CAPACITY
Train and develop for excellence
Create a safe and injury-free environment
Recognize and celebrate individual and team contributions

ELIMINATE ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN
Be easy to do business with

REDUCE COST / INCREASE REVENUE
Deliver cost-effective services

EMBRACE INNOVATION
Engage all staff in continuous improvement
Champion environmental stewardship

OUR GUIDING PRINCIPLES
Respect every individual
Create constancy of purpose
Lead with humility
Assure quality at the source
Create value for the customer

OUR VALUES
Trustworthy
Citizenship
Respect
Responsibility
Fair
Caring
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th># Measure</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build capacity</td>
<td>Hire, train and develop for excellence</td>
<td>L1.1 Bring on the Bronze</td>
<td>MaryJo Blahna</td>
<td>NOT SET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a safe and injury-free environment</td>
<td>L2.1 FS-wide incident rate</td>
<td>Tracey Mosier</td>
<td>&lt;12.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>&lt;3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>&lt;4.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>&lt;9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>&lt;3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>Enhance the customer / stakeholder experience</td>
<td>C1.1 Absentee Rate</td>
<td>John Billen</td>
<td>NOT SET</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>NOT SET</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>NOT SET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide quality campus spaces and places</td>
<td>C2.1 APPA Expended vs Current Replacement Value</td>
<td>Howard Nakase</td>
<td>Measure under development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C2.2 Grounds Investment</td>
<td>Howard Nakase</td>
<td>Measure under development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C2.3 Buildings APPA level 1 or 2</td>
<td>Victor Cardona</td>
<td>Measure under development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be easy to do business with</td>
<td>C3.1 System of Measurement</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Measure under development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C3.2 Visible Results</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Measure under development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C3.3 Action Planning</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Measure under development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>Reduce Cost / Increase Revenue</td>
<td>F1.1 Recharge Center Working Capital</td>
<td>Lori Natsume</td>
<td>NOT SET</td>
<td>174/16</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>59, 14</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>14, 21</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>13, 29</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>10, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F1.2 Direct Labor to Job Availability</td>
<td>Lori Natsume</td>
<td>NOT SET</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F1.3 VM Work Order Actual vs Estimate</td>
<td>Lori Natsume</td>
<td>NOT SET</td>
<td>40.27</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>33.27</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>38.24</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F1.5 Resource Conservation Program: RCM ROI</td>
<td>Norm Menter</td>
<td>NOT SET</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Processes</td>
<td>Engage all staff in continuous improvement</td>
<td>P1.1 Lean participation</td>
<td>Kevin Kramer</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1.2 Employee implementation</td>
<td>Kevin Kramer</td>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Champion environmental stewardship</td>
<td>P2.1 Water conservation</td>
<td>Joe Cook</td>
<td>&lt;1060</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>&lt;1060</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>&lt;1060</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>&lt;1060</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>&lt;1060</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>&lt;1060</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>&lt;1060</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>&lt;1039</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P2.2 Energy conservation</td>
<td>Joe Cook</td>
<td>&lt;184.7</td>
<td>191.4</td>
<td>&lt;184.7</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>&lt;184.7</td>
<td>190.9</td>
<td>&lt;180.7</td>
<td>188.5</td>
<td>&lt;180.7</td>
<td>187.7</td>
<td>&lt;180.7</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>&lt;180.7</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>&lt;185.7</td>
<td>185.1</td>
<td>&lt;185.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P2.3-1 Carbon footprint reduction scope 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>David Ogrodnik</td>
<td>1.7%   (2013)</td>
<td>&gt;9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>&gt;10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P2.3-2 Carbon footprint reduction scope 3</td>
<td>David Ogrodnik</td>
<td>8.0%   (2013)</td>
<td>&gt;9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>&gt;10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P2.4 Waste diversion</td>
<td>Emily Newcomer</td>
<td>&gt;61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>&gt;61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>&gt;61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>&gt;63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>&gt;63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>&gt;63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>&gt;63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>&gt;65%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>&gt;65%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balanced Scorecard FY2016 Q2
## BUILD CAPACITY

### LEARNING AND GROWTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1 – Hire, Train, and Develop for Excellence</th>
<th>PATRICIA COLAIZZO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustained world-class service must reflect the continuing, collaborative effort of all units, functions and employees. We must reinforce a continuous learning organization, growing and developing our people so that they are empowered to implement the changes that accomplish our goals. &quot;Right person, right job, right skills&quot; set up employees for success through hiring, training, coaching and other growth opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L2 – Create a Safe and Injury Free Environment</th>
<th>STEVE CHARVAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We preserve and promote the health and welfare of our employees to deeply reinforce our commitment to the guiding principle of respecting every individual. By promoting and sustaining a safe, healthy, injury-free work environment, all employees identify and develop safe work practices and mitigate hazards in shared commitment to building a safe workplace where people care and protect one another.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective: L1 – Hire, Train, and Develop for Excellence

Measure:
L1.1: Bring on the Bronze: Employee Engagement (BOB:EE)

To fully establish the principles of operational excellence within the organization's culture, the Shingo Bronze Medallion representing success.

Measure Intent:

Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast

Analysis: None, this is a new measure. The target line is representative of a possible date when FS will apply to the Shingo Bronze Prize.

Why: This is the result of the initial FS Leadership survey and the first presentation of this measure. The goal is to make incremental improvements year to year through continuous implementation of initiatives and improvement of existing tools and resources.

Recommendations: FS provides a continuous learning environment. We grow and develop our people so they are empowered to achieve world class service. "Right person, right job, right skills" is our goal.

Forecast: The resources and processes in place will only be successful if FS leaders and staff utilize them.

Measure Formula / Description:

Average leadership survey scores against five Shingo criteria – Frequency, Scope, Duration, Intensity, and Role (with a goal of 5). Scope and Role were not included in this initial survey.

Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast

Analysis: None, this is a new measure. The target line is representative of a possible date when FS will apply to the Shingo Bronze Prize.

Why: This is the result of the initial FS Leadership survey and the first presentation of this measure. The goal is to make incremental improvements year to year through continuous implementation of initiatives and improvement of existing tools and resources.

Recommendations: FS provides a continuous learning environment. We grow and develop our people so they are empowered to achieve world class service. "Right person, right job, right skills" is our goal.

Forecast: The resources and processes in place will only be successful if FS leaders and staff utilize them.

Linked Initiatives/Activities

| R | Q2 FY2016 – Development of Phase 2 of Practical Leader Series |
| G | Q2 FY2016 – Establishment and implementation of 10 FES initiatives |
The initiatives included in this measure are FES specific and intended to support FS with tools and resources to improve preparations for submitting an application for the Shingo Bronze Medallion.

This data was the first survey taken by FS Leadership to determine a baseline for this measure and provides FES with future areas to focus on.

This measure is being scored against the Shingo standards including the five criteria:

1. Frequency: How often is this being used by FS
2. Duration: How long has this been in place
3. Intensity: How well integrated is this with employees
4. Scope: Is the behavior widespread throughout the organization
5. Role: Is there appropriate focus on tools, systems and principles at each level of the organization: leaders, managers and associates

(Scope and Role were not measured in this initial survey)

Each initiative is scored independently and all scores are then aggregated to produce a final overall score.

**BOB:EE Overall Score** 3.1
**Objective:** L2 – Create a Safe and Injury Free Environment

**Measure:** L2.1: FS-Wide Incident Rate

**Owner:** Tracey Mosier

### Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast

**Analysis:** The Q4 target of reducing the incident rate by one (1) from the lowest level achieved in Q4 any year was met FS wide.

**Why:** There were 71 recordable accidents in FS in 2015. This is 18 fewer accidents than in 2014, and 10 less recordable accidents than goal (81). Four (4) of the seven (7) departments (FES & EM are combined, as are AVP and SI) did not meet their departmental targets for the quarter. One department (1) is at an incident rate of zero (0). Two departments met their goal.

**Recommendations:** FS Leaders should continue their efforts to reinforce the use of safe work practices and the available tools to identify hazards (Hazard Review Checklists, field checks by the Supervisor to assure safety training knowledge is being used, work plans and permits being completed and followed, proper and consistent use of PPE). OARS reports should be reviewed and lessons learned implemented within each department, and FS wide when applicable. FS Safety will be evaluating effective incentives for reducing accidents and sharing their recommendations with FS leaders.

**Forecast:** If focused effort is made, FS can meet and exceed the goal for 2016, a rate of 6.9.

### Measure Intent:

Incident rate is the best proxy indicator for safety, and can reflect if our safety improvement efforts are successful.

### Measure Formula / Description:

Incident rate = the number of recordable incidents X hours worked YTD by 100 FTE*/actual hours worked by all FTE. *Q1=50,000, Q2= 100,000, Q3=150,000, Q4= 200,000.

### Linked Initiatives/Activities

- Safety awareness training

**FS Q4 (CY) Incident Data**

**Incident rate for Q4 (2012 - 2015)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Incident Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective: L2 – Create a Safe and Injury Free Environment

Measure:
L2.1: FS-Wide Incident Rate

Supplementary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Incident Rate (Q4 2015)</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FMC</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP/SI</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSD</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FABS</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FES/EM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incident Rate by Department Commentary

FMC - 34 recordable incidents through QE 12/31/15. Q4 2015 target was a rate of 12.4. This goal was achieved!

CEO – 5 recordable incidents through QE 12/31/15. The target for Q4 2015 was a rate of 5.9. This goal was achieved!

BSD - 22 recordable incidents through QE 12/31/15. The target for Q4 2015 was a rate of 6.3.

FABS - 3 recordable incidents through QE 12/31/15. Q4 2015 target was a rate of 0.8.

FES/EM - 0 recordable incidents through QE 12/31/15. Q4 2015 target was a rate of 0. This goal was achieved.

TS – 6 recordable incidents through QE 12/31/15. The target for Q4 2015 was a rate of 0.

AVP - 1 recordable incidents through QE 12/31/15. The target for Q3 2015 was a rate of 0.
FS Wide Incident Rate by Quarter, Over Time (Q4 2015)

BLS DATA for Washington State 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Incident Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All industries</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of buildings</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy &amp; CE construction</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty trade contractors</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit/Ground passenger transportation</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing and storage</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management and remediation services</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair and maintenance</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective: L2 – Create a Safe and Injury Free Environment

Measure:
L2.1: FS-Wide Incident Rate

Supplementary Information

Owner: Tracey Mosier
## C1 – Deliver a Campus Ready for Business Each Day

DAMON FETTERS

So that the campus community can focus on achieving their purpose, Facilities Services delivers campus buildings and infrastructure to meet the requirements of the university. We optimize delivery of essential services and mitigate disruption when the unexpected occurs. By focusing on resilient systems and work processes, we deliver quality services, given events in and outside of our direct control.

## C2 – Provide Quality Spaces and Places

GENE WOODARD

World-class academics, research, and patient care are enabled and enhanced by world-class facilities and public spaces. We improve the aesthetics, functionality, and quality of spaces and places that help to define the UW experience. Through the prioritization of spaces and places by utilization, prominence, and need for improvement we, increase the quality of campus spaces and places.
More effectively assign staff based on work Area needs in order to prioritize effective use of labor; and to enable the department to plan for future staffing and funding requests.

**Measure Intent:**

**Measure Formula / Description:** Percentage of actual working hours (at work) by possible working hours. Only includes classified or overtime eligible staff.

**Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast**

**Analysis:** The All-FS average is 84.3 (not shown on chart). The Target will be developed in next few quarters as the data can be analyzed.

**Why:** Full staffing allows for adequate support of customer requests and essential business services. To ensure proper leave planning and allow departments to provide a campus ready to do business with. All data is showing classified staff only.

**Recommendations:** Develop the measure into a useful tool to assist FS Departments to better manage their staffing levels and to predicate costs. Use all leave types to show an accurate count of staff absent. If a staff member is absent from work for any reason production suffers.

**Forecast:** Will be better determined with time and in using the activities listed below.
Objective C1: Deliver a Campus Ready for Business Each Day.

Measure:
C1.1: Absentee Rate

Supplementary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Expected?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - ANNUAL</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - ANNUAL LEAVE</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM - ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB - ANNUAL FAITH BASED</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - BEREAVEMENT</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - CIVIL/JURY</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP - COMPENSATORY TIME PREMIUM OT RATE</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT - COMP TIME USED</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB - FAITH BASED</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H - HOURLY</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU - HOLIDAY COMP TIME USED</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L - LEAVE WITHOUT PAY</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFB - LEAVE WITHOUT PAY FAITH BASED</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M - MILITARY</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT - OVERTIME</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH - PERSONAL HOLIDAY</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R - REGULAR SALARIED HOURS</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S - SICK</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL - SHARED LEAVE</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST - STRAIGHT TIME</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of leave over time (Sick / LWP)

The overall absentee data is factored using all leave code, the chart above shows a couple of the leave types that have been the highest in the past several quarters. This chart is to be used as a comparison to show leave usage across several quarters.

Upcoming -
- This measure started in Q1 FY16. In the next several quarters we will be contacting the other FS Department Directors to get there input on what elements of attendance would assist them in better understanding how to focus on reliable and predictable attendance.
- Will be adding a metric showing Absentee hours by FTE.
- At this time FMLA usage is included in the appropriate leave code. Would like to find a way to strip the FMLA usage from the leave codes and show as separate data.
**Objective C1: Deliver a Campus Ready for Business Each Day.**

**Measure:**
**C1.2: Open Maintenance Orders (NOT READY)**

**Measure Intent:**

<p>| The duration of active maintenance orders is indicative of Facility Services daily business readiness. By reducing the time maintenance orders are open, FS will be able to deliver services to customers without interruption or delay. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Intent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Measure under construction]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective: C2 – Provide Quality Spaces and Places

Measure: C2.2: Grounds Investment (PROPOSED)

Measure Intent:
Measuring the (+/-) success relationship between Grounds site reviews and the APPA standard levels and demonstrating how investment of additional resources relates to the APPA standards.

Steps Towards Grounds Investment Measure
1. Landscape Analysis
2. Establish Service Levels – “Levels of Care”
3. Identify Priority Areas
4. Gain Campus-wide Support
5. Realign Maintenance Zones
6. Develop Maintenance Standards & Staffing Metrics
**Objective:** C2 – Provide Quality Spaces and Places

**Measure:** C2.3: Custodial APPA Level 1 or 2

**Owner:** Victor Cardona

---

**Measure Intent:**
Keep the Department informed about the effectiveness of its cleaning at the highest possible level.

**Measure Formula / Description:**
Divide number of buildings achieving APPA level 2 or higher (orderly tidiness) by total number of buildings inspected.

---

**Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast**

**Analysis:** The target of 78% was not met for this quarter. 64% of the buildings inspected were at APPA level 2 or higher, which is the highest quarter on record since January of 2012.

**Why:**

**Recommendations:**
- Use the Customer item summary report to identify and correct deficiencies (focusing on items with a score of 92.10% or lower).
- Follow up on inspections to make sure errors are corrected.
- Better identify what is acceptable and not-acceptable
- Have an independent inspector perform all inspections
- Use Geo-Sims to better identify area in buildings, especially hallways.

**Forecast:** Target will be hard to achieve unless initiatives, recommendations, and activities are followed. With continued “centipede” and use of the deficiency reports the target may be achieved in the next couple of quarters.

---

**Linked Initiatives/Activities**

- Have 2 “centipede” processes each year
Breakdown by Area (FY 2016 Q1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings at APPA Level 2 or Higher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Buildings Inspected</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Building Inspected at APPA Level 2 or Higher</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Appa Level by Building</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average UW Perct Level by Building</td>
<td>98.10%</td>
<td>97.80%</td>
<td>90.10%</td>
<td>91.80%</td>
<td>98.50%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td>92.80%</td>
<td>95.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary

The percentage of buildings at APPA level 2 or higher increased to 64% this quarter, up from 45% last quarter. The current level of 64% of buildings at APPA level 2 or higher is the highest on record, beating out the previous record by 1%.

Suggest the target level be kept at the current level. Even though the target has never been reached, we believe this is a target level the department should strive towards and is a target that can be reached with training and feedback.
To allow our customers to focus on their missions, we make interactions with Facilities Services as efficient and customer focused as possible. We assess customer feedback and engage in proactive communications to continuously improve our processes.
To increase the percentage of teams that have developed a system of measuring the four key elements of successful customer interactions.
Measure Intent:

To increase the percentage of teams that have a visual tracking system for their measurements related to the four key elements of successful customer interactions.
Measure Intent:

To increase the percentage of teams that have a system in place to act on their operational and strategic measurements related to the four key elements of successful customer interactions.
As stewards of public and student funds, we have an obligation to deliver the greatest possible value. We will accomplish this by empowering our employees to identify and implement solutions and efficiencies to reduce cost and increase value through process improvements.
To monitor the recharge center working capital. Working capital is an amount up to a maximum of 60 days of expenditures the recharge center can retain to fund operations during fluctuations of revenue and expenditure. A high working capital could be the result of higher recharge rate.

**Measure Formula / Description:**

Days of Working Capital = \( \frac{\text{Budget Balance}}{\text{Daily Expenditure}} \)

**Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast**

**Analyses:** As of 12/31/2015, days of working capital for Fleet Services and Facilities Construction were 10 and 15 respectively. Both were under the 60 days limit and the budget balance remained positive.

**Why:**

- Days of working capital for Construction was reduced from 29 to 15 due to lower productivity rate. Productivity rate is usually lower when school is session and during holiday season.
- Fleet Services’ days of working capital remained stable down from 13 to 10. Both the revenue and expenditures were down by 10% compared with last quarter.

**Recommendations:** Working capital is a common measure of a department’s overall financial health. Positive working capital allows department to invest in technologies, improve aging infrastructure and fund critical issues. An appropriate working capital level should be strategically planned and determined during rate development. Considerations for achieving the targeted working capital include control over revenue and expense, productivity rate and inventory level (not overstocked).

**Forecast:** Expect the days of working capital for both units to remain under the 60 days limit.

**Linked Initiatives/Activities**

- No linked initiatives
Objective: F1 – Deliver Cost-Effective Services

Measure: F1.2: Direct Labor to Job Availability

To measure unit direct labor to job availability in delivering cost-effective services to clients. Compare total labor hours applied directly to work orders with the total labor hours on site. Higher direct labor to job availability could result a lower charge rate.

**Measure Formula / Description:**

Direct labor to job availability % = hours applied directly to work orders/total hours on site/100

**Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast**

**Analyses:** The productive rate for Facilities Construction was low as expected at 69% in the quarter ending 12/31/2015. Historically, the productive rate is lowest in the 4th quarter of the year during the business cycle because of the holidays and more vacation days. The productive rate for current fiscal year was 74%.

**Why:** Because of the nature of business and operation, each unit has a different target. Facilities Construction has more estimating/planning and communication with clients, thus the direct labor to Job productivity level is lower. Facilities Maintenance and Campus Operations have less planning and estimating as 80% of labor are contributed to absorbed work orders.

**Recommendations:** The target for each unit was the level needed to generate enough recharges/revenue to balance budgets. Maximizing direct labor to job availability along with overhead cost reduction can offer clients a lower charge rate.

**Forecast:** The Summer months (July – September) are usually busy. It is expected that the productivity would be high. Target in FY16 was increased to 77% for Construction and 83% for Maintenance and Operations. If the productive rate remains above target for the rest of fiscal year, the FY17 loading rate could be lowered.

**Linked Initiatives/Activities**

- No linked initiatives
To measure how closely estimated costs match actual costs. Poor estimate quality can result in client dissatisfaction.

**Measure Intent:**

**Measure Formula / Description:**

Chargeable maintenance and construction work orders that closed within the quarter and had estimate and actual costs.

# work order variance within -10/+10% divided by total number of work orders

**Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast**

**Analysis:** For the quarter ending 12/31/2015, the variances were 25% and 0% for time & material and fixed cost respectively. The overall combined variance was 20%, and the overall cost difference was approximately $7,000.

Only 6 fixed cost work orders were closed during the 4th quarter and none of them was within the 10% variance. The variance for the fixed cost work orders generally would not raise concerns and questions as the estimates were re-approved by the clients, but it would have either a positive or negative financial impact. The variance for time & material jobs could have negative reactions from clients especially when the variance is larger.

**Why:** Naturally, some factors will always be unpredictable, leading to a slight difference between the two. The variance of -10/+10% with a 90% confidence is considered to be acceptable. The large discrepancies between actual and estimate could be caused by poor estimates or poor planning.

**Recommendations:** Provide staff training in estimating and evaluate cost effectiveness to have an estimator on staff.

**Forecast:** Without a good estimate quality practice in place, it is likely that the discrepancies between actual and estimate will not meet the target range.

**Linked Initiatives/Activities**

Planned hiring of contract estimator
## AiM Work Order Actual and Estimate Variance: 1st quarter 2014 – 1st quarter 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Order Type</th>
<th># of Work Order</th>
<th>&lt;10%</th>
<th>% of WO with -10/+10% Variance</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Over/ (Under) Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TM (construction)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1,698,035</td>
<td>1,699,048</td>
<td>1,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM (Maintenance)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>194,339</td>
<td>242,556</td>
<td>48,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (Construction)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>202,977</td>
<td>184,838</td>
<td>(18,139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (Maintenance)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>267</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,095,351</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,126,442</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,091</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM (construction)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1,555,855</td>
<td>1,399,991</td>
<td>(155,864)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM (Maintenance)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>320,320</td>
<td>528,460</td>
<td>208,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (Construction)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>107,365</td>
<td>106,250</td>
<td>(1,115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (Maintenance)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25,194</td>
<td>17,424</td>
<td>(7,770)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>266</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,008,734</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,052,125</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,391</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM (construction)</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1,861,389</td>
<td>1,680,863</td>
<td>(180,526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM (Maintenance)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>409,858</td>
<td>403,752</td>
<td>(6,106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (Construction)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>699,269</td>
<td>616,022</td>
<td>(83,247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (Maintenance)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28,187</td>
<td>27,179</td>
<td>(1,008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>298</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,998,703</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,727,817</strong></td>
<td><strong>270,887</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM (construction)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1,702,618</td>
<td>1,540,892</td>
<td>(161,726)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM (Maintenance)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>325,365</td>
<td>371,580</td>
<td>46,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (Construction)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>178,536</td>
<td>230,902</td>
<td>52,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (Maintenance)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>252</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,206,519</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,143,374</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,145</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM (construction)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2,137,851</td>
<td>1,867,927</td>
<td>(269,923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM (Maintenance)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>363,509</td>
<td>488,152</td>
<td>124,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (Construction)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>173,695</td>
<td>122,846</td>
<td>(50,849)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (Maintenance)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,676,555</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,479,940</strong></td>
<td><strong>196,615</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM (construction)</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3,182,007</td>
<td>2,891,743</td>
<td>(290,265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM (Maintenance)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>760,204</td>
<td>869,338</td>
<td>109,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (Construction)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>322,054</td>
<td>263,483</td>
<td>(58,571)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (Maintenance)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100,409</td>
<td>99,264</td>
<td>(1,145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>410</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,364,675</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,123,828</strong></td>
<td><strong>240,847</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM (construction)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1,104,953</td>
<td>796,260</td>
<td>(308,693)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM (Maintenance)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>594,666</td>
<td>897,849</td>
<td>303,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (Construction)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25,234</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>(1,233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC (Maintenance)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,724,852</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,718,109</strong></td>
<td><strong>(6,743)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

It has been noted that a decrease in fixed cost contracts has occurred over the last few years. Reasons may include a poor estimation process – hence a need for this measure.
G

To compare the steam cost per 1000 lbs with national average based on Power Plant current steam system. The cost is dependent upon unit fuel cost, Power Plant operating cost, and distribution maintenance cost.

**Measure Intent:**

**Measure Formula / Description:**

$/1000$ lbs = Total operating and Capital cost/Total Steam Produced/1000

**Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast**

**Analyses:** UW Power Plant generated about 1.1M units (1000 lbs per unit) steam in FY15 to heat 168 buildings with approximately 13M GSF. For the quarter ending 12/31/2015, the average steam cost for per 1000 lbs was $9.22, the lowest in the last two years. The lower fuel price (31% cost reduction started 11/1/2015) is the key factor to the overall lower steam cost as 60% of the steam cost is from the fuel.

**Why:** In addition to the fuel price reduction, minimized number of boilers running, keep up preventive maintenance schedule (less breakdown) and keep staff to a minimum level (increase productivity). The higher steam cost in the summer months was due to a low demand in steam with same level of staffing cost.

**Recommendations:** Benchmarking the fuel cost of steam generation, in dollars per 1,000 pounds ($/1,000 lb) of steam, is an effective way to assess the efficiency of the steam system. Also taking advantage of the lower fuel price to co-generate more electricity would save the overall energy cost.

**Forecast:** Expect the steam cost to be lower than the national average. When fuel price goes down, the steam cost would go down as well.

**Linked Initiatives/Activities**

None / TBD
Objective: F1 – Deliver Cost-Effective Services

Measure:
F1.4: Steam Cost

Supplementary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner: Lori Natsume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Average Steam Cost Per 1000 lbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water/Sewer</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>3.209</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>2.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>3.653</td>
<td>2.044</td>
<td>1.614</td>
<td>2.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>8.300</td>
<td>7.585</td>
<td>7.150</td>
<td>7.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>14.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>1.516</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3.209</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>2.943</td>
<td>2.698</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>2.077</td>
<td>4.051</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>2.082</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>2.082</td>
<td>0.980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective: F1 – Deliver Cost-Effective Services

Measure:
F1.5: Resource Conservation Program: RCM ROI

Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast

Analysis: All RCM’s completed must be cost effective (IE: ROI>1.00). FY16, 2nd Qtr. ROI of $2.41 saved for each $1 invested represents the highest quarterly return to date.

Why: Building on the fact based outcomes from the RCP Audit Program; Resource Conservation Projects executed have a positive return on investment thus avoid additional utility cost while reducing deferred maintenance backlog without burden to Minor Capital Program.

Recommendations: Execution of RCM’s depends on close support by operational depts. to execute work. Development of timely spend plans, coordinated execution schedules, resources will lead to efficient execution of projects going forward. Baseline LEAN process for tracking rebate opportunities will lead to increased revenues and accelerated capital turn rates.

Forecast: As the ROI increases the resulting positive cash flow will fund and implement more of the current $20 M in planned cost effective RCM’s, with potential to reduce utility cost by $3.5 million annually, increase conservation revenues by $6 million, reduce deferred maintenance and repair backlog, and increase staff focus on preventative maintenance and repair. Successful energy audit program (9.38 million GSF audited in 27 months) should be replicated in capital planning and assessment of new projects.

Measure Intent:
Insure completed RCM’s are cost effective (defined as RCM’s that save more utility cost over the life of the improvement than the initial capital cost of the improvement.

Measure Description:
ROI = Total utility $ saved over the life of the improvement per $1 net capital Invested. Net Capital Investment = (Labor & Material) – Rebates & Grants Secured

Linked Initiatives/Activities

R Q2 FY2016 - FMC Lighting retrofit process is launched!

G Q1 FY2016 – Rebate Lean Team improves ROI Process
Objective: F1 – Deliver Cost-Effective Services

Measure: F1.5: Resource Conservation Program: RCM ROI

Completed Resource Conservation Measure - Return on Investment Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 14.4</th>
<th>FY 15.1</th>
<th>FY 15.2</th>
<th>FY 15.3</th>
<th>FY 15.4</th>
<th>FY 16.1</th>
<th>FY 16.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Savings</td>
<td>$362,349</td>
<td>$4,674,375</td>
<td>$8,944</td>
<td>$158,460</td>
<td>$550,121</td>
<td>$1,506</td>
<td>$160,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Investment</td>
<td>$659,364</td>
<td>$2,314,637</td>
<td>$8,732</td>
<td>$87,318</td>
<td>$615,700</td>
<td>$1,074</td>
<td>$66,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebates/Grants</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$352,556</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$18,800</td>
<td>$132,974</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Capital Investment</td>
<td>$659,364</td>
<td>$1,962,081</td>
<td>$8,732</td>
<td>$68,518</td>
<td>$482,726</td>
<td>$1,074</td>
<td>$66,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Avoided Life (MgCo2e)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Completed projects:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: Completed projects:

- Irrigation Controls
- Physics Astronomy Lab Ventilation
- ESCO
- UW RCP funded Shop 17 Insulation projects
- UW Tower Plumbing Fixture Replacement Project
- UW Tower Chiller Replacement and UW IBM Tivoli Management Software
- Clark Hall retro Commissioning Initiative partnering w/ Shop 69
- 15-17 Biennium Shop 17 Insulation Projects MHSC Wings, I, RR, B, D, F

Commentary

- The table above provides the relevant, pertinent details that inform calculation of the measure.
- The table also the cumulative Statistics provides a snapshot of completed Resource Conservation Measures over the past 7 qtrs. are:
  - $3.75M invested
    - $504K in rebates secured
    - $5.92M in utility cost avoided over the life of the improvements
    - cumulative ROI: $1.82 saved for $1 invested.
- The Shop 17 Insulation Projects completed in FY16 Q2 are noteworthy for a number of reasons:
  - These are the first “new “15-17 conservation projects completed in thus far in the biennium.
  - Initiative provides a steady predictable rechargeable work load for Shop 17 while improving the safety of the work environment in five mechanical rooms in MHSC.
  - Pipe insulation restoration is a high value, low cost BMP maintenance task.
  - Transparency and accountability are enhanced thru visual management tools, spend plans, rebate LEAN.

Supplementary Information

Owner: Norm Menter
# INTERNAL PROCESS

## EMBRACE INNOVATION

### P1 – Engage All Staff in Continuous Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUANN STOKKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees have ideas, insight, and innovations that help us evolve, adapt, and innovate to thrive in a changing environment. To create a culture of natural workgroups and regular huddles, teams share thoughts, ideas, and best practices to improve the work on a daily basis. Facilities Services will mature the four key systems by embracing, accepting and implementing goal-focused ideas from all employees to create change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### P2 – Champion Environmental Stewardship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOHN CHAPMAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Services delivers energy and manages infrastructure, which impacts the environment. Through innovation and collaboration, we actively conserve resources and are leaders in the University’s sustainability efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective: P1 – Engage All Staff in Continuous Improvement

Measure:
P1.1 Lean Participation

Measure Intent:
Engaging as many FS employees as possible in formal Lean activities to create a culture of continuous improvement.

Measure Formula / Description:
The number of regular huddle participants as reported to the monthly idea count survey divided by the number of FTE's.

Data gathered from https://www.washington.edu/facilities/requests/idea-count

Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast

Analysis: The overall target of 80% huddle participation rate has not been met. This quarter’s participation rate of 44.3% continues the upward trend towards the target. Four of the 8 FS departments met the target.

Why: Teams are being slowly added to the reporting list. The rate is not as fast as anticipated, but remains positive in relation to employee turnover. FMC has the highest number of non-participatory employees, however some teams may be missing from the participation count and several are planned for launch soon.

Recommendations: Continue launching teams with the direct purpose of creating natural huddles. Encourage behavior through recognition of active teams. Develop huddles around idea boards at the management and director level to lead by example. Improve the survey reminder and team lead reporting system.

Forecast: With many upcoming launches scheduled the participation rate will most likely increase. BSD reaching 50% participation should be a sign that lean culture has reached a tipping point and will continue upward, the numbers of which will help FS’s overall average.

Linked Initiatives/Activities

R Q3 FY16 - 11 Teams to be launched (4 FMC, 7 BSD)
G Q1 FY16 – Backfilled all missing participation data
Notes on Participation Rates

On a departmental level,
- UWEM, FABS, and FES bounce around the 100% mark, individuals time off have a larger contribution to fluctuating numbers in these smaller departments, still their 90%+ participation has exceeded the target of 80%.
- BSD and CEO continue adding teams and thus the upward trend.
- TS dropped again in participation, likely due to missing team participation counts (19 are known missing from the Shuttles team).
- FMC decreases slightly, but remains with the lowest participation levels. Some teams are noted as missing submissions.

Note: Teams are told to report, even if no ideas are generated/implemented. This is so the huddle count remains consistent. Even in this case, some teams do not report.

• http://bit.ly/uwideaccount for more detail

The Numbers (Averages from Jul-Sep 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>Avg Headcount</th>
<th>Avg Huddlers</th>
<th>% Huddlers per Dept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPCI</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWEM</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FES</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FABS</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>137.7</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>111.3</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSD</td>
<td>263.0</td>
<td>132.3</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMC</td>
<td>304.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>899.3</td>
<td>398.7</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rate of implementation of employee ideas is an indicator of employee engagement and of a management system that values and encourages employee engagement.

Measure Intent:
The rate of implementation of employee ideas is an indicator of employee engagement and of a management system that values and encourages employee engagement.

Measure Formula / Description:
Total ideas implemented divided by the number of huddle participants (and FTE's). Huddle participants are as documented in each idea count survey.

Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast

Analysis: Ideas implemented per huddle participant and FTE have not met the target of two ideas per person (quarterly average). This quarter’s average ideas implemented was above 1 idea per person for the first time on record.

Why: Historically Q2 averages have been around 0.75 ideas implemented per person but have typically been higher than Q1 averages. It is unknown why this quarter saw such a large spike in ideas per person. If the trend continues, it can be assumed that Lean culture is beginning to take a stronger hold of FS culture.

Recommendations: Create incentives around implementing ideas, such as a recognition event for sustaining a 2.0 average over 6 months. Also continue gembas with teams and reminders to submit idea counts to show teams that their contributions do matter.

Forecast: It is predicted this measure will see an increase in the upcoming quarters as more individuals participate and contribute to idea generation and implementation. Quarter 3 averages are typically similar to Q2, so in the near future its predicted to be similarly high. Further results will depend on the efforts of leadership to sustain Lean culture. New efforts in planning, including the “Be easy to do business” measures should help as well.

Linked Initiatives/Activities

G Q3 FY2015 - Email reminders of idea count submissions for late submitters
G Q4 FY2015 - FS Team Gembas by Charles, LuAnn, and Kevin
Idea implementation remains an important indicator of lean activity within FS which is a secondary indicator to process improvements. Teams and departments with a high rate of ideas implementation are believed to be great communicators and problem solvers. It is our goal to have a high rate of implementation throughout all of FS.

Objective: P2 – Champion Environmental Stewardship

Measure: P2.1: Water Conservation

Owner: Joe Cook

Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast

Analysis: 1,080,000 gpd average daily water consumption for previous rolling 12 months is 0.2% below 1,082,000 gpd baseline and failed to met 4% target. Water usage is 0.6% higher than the previous rolling 12-M period.

Why: This period’s increase over the previous period is due to record hot summer temperatures requiring more water for cooling towers, draining and refilling of Drumheller Fountain in May, heavy irrigation of Rainier Vista’s landscaping, and new construction related to WCUP, ARCF, Nano.

Recommendations: Possible measures include reducing incoming water PRV settings at buildings; expanding automated irrigation; subsurface water pipe leak detection; replace single-pass city-water cooled units (15 known units); at cooling towers - recover waste heat, add deduct meters; replace pure water stills with point-of-use polishers; harvest roof rainwater or experiment water for irrigation or non-potable applications (for makeup water at CP cooling towers)

Forecast: We should see more water savings when summer outdoor temperatures return closer to their historical average. Water savings from current linked activities may be offset when new buildings come online in the next several years, including ARCF, NanoES, UWMC Phase 2 and others.

Measure Intent:
Water conservation is one of the best indicators of our impact as a champion of environmental stewardship.

Measure Formula / Description:
Central campus annual water consumption in gallons/total number of days. Data from 7 main meters serving ~12.5M ft2 of building area and ~6.3M ft2 of irrigated landscaped area. Excludes non-central buildings served directly by SPU.

Linked Initiatives/Activities:
- G EE/CSE, Publication Svcs cooling tower replacements operating
- G Allen Library server room city-water cooled air conditioner replacement
- R Central Cooling Water system is making up water from an unknown location TBD
- R J-Wing and H-Wing cooling towers failing, need replacement
For central campus only, water+sewer costs of ~$8.47M during year ending 12/15 are an increase of ~$1.12M over prior year. Higher cost due to higher usage plus 0.6% higher water rate and 0.7% higher sewer rate compared to year prior. Water+Sewer Cost = $0.021/gallon

WCUP, ARCF, and Nano construction are using additional water (e.g., draining pipes for relocation)

J-Wing and H-Wing cooling towers are in poor shape, with H-Wing’s tube bundle leaking and J-Wing sometimes switched into emergency city water backup mode for repairs

Compare to prior year – Heating Degree Days down 5% to 3742, Cooling Degree Days up 17% to 430

Irrigation Shop reports they operated around 125% of normal this past summer due to hot weather. Rainier Vista project did not have meter installed over summer to monitor heavy irrigation for new turf/plantings.

Central Plant cooling tower makeup up 30% to 35M gal

More students and staff on campus - 72976 FTE in 2014/15 versus 59802 FTE in 2008/09

Objective: P2 – Champion Environmental Stewardship

Measure:
P2.1: Water Conservation

Commentary

EE/CSE: New Nalco 3D Trasar controller automates chemical monitoring and treatment

Optimal cycles of concentration around 10 with tower conductivity at 750 µS/cm and incoming water around 75 µS/cm
Objective: P2 – Champion Environmental Stewardship

Measure: P2.1: Water Conservation

Timeline of Major Projects on “Central” Campus by Capital Projects Office and Facilities Services

Baseline Year:
- CCW PICV PH I ESCO SC
- MHSC T Cooling Tower

CLARK SC
- PACCAR SC
- HUTCHINSON RENO. SC
- CEDAR SC
- POPLAR SC
- HALL HEALTH SC
- CENTRAL PLANT CCW HEAT RECOVERY SC

Supplementary Information:

Objective: Champion Environmental Stewardship

Measure: P2.1: Water Conservation

Gallons (1000s) / Day

Target (4% below 1082 kGPD baseline, effective 7/15)

Owner: Joe Cook

John Chapman
Objective: P2 – Champion Environmental Stewardship

Measure: P2.2: Energy Conservation

Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast

Analysis: 185.4 kBtu/ft²/year annual energy consumption (normalized for heating degree days) for previous rolling 12 months is 6.6% below 198.6 EUI baseline and failed to meet 11% target. Energy usage is up slightly compared to previous period.

Why: Energy use is down compared to several years ago despite more people on campus, new tenant improvements adding more equipment into existing buildings, and hotter summer temperatures increasing chiller demand. Current adjustment for HDD assumes 53% of fuel is affected from Oct-May, but we’re likely also seeing higher city water temperatures that reduces domestic HW heating demand year round. Actual non-normalized annual energy is 2,458,809 mmBtu (versus prior year’s 2,454,071 mmBtu) with a peak of 257,300 mmBtu in December 2015 and a low of 166,715 in August 2015.

Recommendations: Possible measures include manifolding fume exhaust fans together during roof replacements (Bagley, MHSC); returning dumped steam condensate (POA4 and Guthrie Annexes); adding runaround heat recovery loops where not installed in 100% outside air buildings (e.g. EE/CSE, E-Court); more VFD installs; retrofit inline circulator pumps with ECM motors; building lighting retrofits; LED street lights

Forecast: Forecasted energy consumption rate will likely remain steady in the near future because reduced usage from recent conservation projects may be offset by new buildings Nano-Engineering, ARCF, UWMC Phase 2, with future electric vehicle charging also increasing usage.

Measure Intent: Energy conservation is one of the best indicators of our impact as a champion of environmental stewardship.

Central campus annual electricity used in kBtu/gross floor area + annual fuel used in kBtu/gross floor area (adjusted for heating degree days). Excludes non-central campus energy usage.

Linked Initiatives/Activities

G AA-Wing (4/15), H-Wing (6/15) chiller replacements commissioned and operating
G Wallace Hall chiller replacement in design to connect to more efficient CCW/WCUP
Y Leaking steam valves replaced at K-Wing, other leaking valves also to be replaced
Objective: P2 – Champion Environmental Stewardship

Measure: P2.2: Energy Conservation

### Annual Energy Use Intensity (Site), by Energy Source for previous rolling 12-M period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy Source</th>
<th>EUI, kBtu/ft²/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>124.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

- For central campus only, energy costs of ~$26.6M during the year ending Dec 2015 are an increase of ~$536k compared to the prior year. Electricity rate increased 6.6% to $0.063/kWh while gas rate increased 5.6% to $0.57/therm over previous year.
- Current plan targets an additional 2% reduction per year to achieve Climate Action Plan goals for greenhouse gas emission reductions. For central campus only, capital cost to reduce energy use by 2% in 2015 is estimated to be ~$6.4M (based on several assumed unknown variables such as installing projects with maximum 10-year simple payback period and ~300k GSF growth per year).
- Central Plant chiller usage up 32% to 19866432 ton-hours, steam usage down 11% to 1084752 klbs, turbine generator electricity down 22% to 12978814 kWh, compressed air down 2.5% to 851732 kCF

**Supplementary Information**

**Objective:** P2 – Champion Environmental Stewardship

**Measure:** P2.2: Energy Conservation

**Commentary**

- Compared to the previous period, electricity use ratio is down 3.3% and fuel use ratio is up 2.2%.
- Compared to 10-year averages, this period’s heating degree days remain below normal and cooling degree days remain well above normal.
- For this measure, data includes buildings supplied by electricity from East and West Receiving Stations (~13.6M ft²) and UW Central Plant steam (~12.9M ft²), and excludes buildings supplied directly by public utilities SCL (electricity) and PSE (natural gas). EUI (Site) includes energy consumed on the campus-level as metered by public utilities at Receiving Stations (electricity) and Central Plant (natural gas and fuel oil).

**Commentary**

- New Electric Vehicle Charging Stations Installed by TS in mid-2015
  - Parking Lot N22 north of HUB
  - Portage Bay Parking Facility
  - Owner: Joe Cook
Objective: P2 – Champion Environmental Stewardship

Measure: P2.2: Energy Conservation

Supplementary Information

Owner: Joe Cook

Timeline of Major Projects on “Central” Campus by Capital Projects Office and Facilities Services

- Current Target (11% below 198.6 EUI, effective 7/2015)

- Baseline Year

- Present

- Project Locations and Dates

- Chart showing energy conservation projects and their corresponding EUI, kBtu/ft²/year values.
Measure Intent:
Estimating Scope 1 & 2 carbon emissions measures UW’s progress towards meeting its carbon footprint reduction goal. Scope 1 emissions originate from UW-owned equipment & facilities. Scope 2 emissions originate from non-UW facilities that produce the steam & electricity UW uses.

Measure Formula / Description:
Annual percent metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent (MgCO$_{2}$e) emissions reduction is calculated by comparing estimated calendar year MgCO$_{2}$e emissions relative to estimated baseline calendar year 2005 emissions.

Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast

Analysis: The UW is not currently on target to reduce annual Scope 1 & 2 carbon footprint emissions to 15% below the 2005 baseline calendar year by 2020.

Why: Year-to-year differences in weather, Power Plant turbine generator electrical production, and boiler fuel type usage (oil vs. natural gas) cause annual percent MgCO$_{2}$e reduction values to vary. However, the overall trend indicates that the UW is not on target to reduce its carbon footprint sufficiently to meet carbon emissions reduction goals.

Recommendations: The UW Environmental Stewardship Committee (ESC) is defining three (3) initiatives to reduce carbon emissions: 1) steam-to-hot water conversion, 2) laboratory energy reduction, and 3) server room centralization and virtualization. FS is also implementing energy-saving projects that reduce carbon emissions.

Forecast: The UW will not meet its carbon footprint reduction goal without implementing energy-saving initiatives. However, the UW could instead decide to purchase Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) and/or carbon credits beginning in 2020 to offset carbon emissions that in excess of the 15% carbon footprint reduction goal. Developing and implementing additional energy-saving initiatives prior to 2020 will reduce or eliminate the need to purchase RECs and/or carbon credits in the future.
Objective: P2 – Champion Environmental Stewardship

Measure: P2.3-1: Carbon Footprint Reduction Scope 1&2

Supplementary Information

Commentary

- Scope 1 includes “direct” emissions from UW equipment and facilities (natural gas heating, vehicle fleets, landfill). Scope 2 includes “energy import” emissions from non-UW facilities that generate the steam and electricity purchased by UW-owned facilities.

- Increasing landfill MgCO$_2$e reduction is expected to continue as landfill emissions decrease with landfill age.

- Increased MgCO$_2$e 2014 reduction is associated with warmer weather which decreases building steam heating demand. Increased domestic water supply temperature, associated with warm weather-related low snowpack water runoff, also reduced hot water steam heating demand.

- Seattle vehicle MgCO$_2$e reduction remains stable.

- The trend toward decreasing Seattle Buildings and Bothell MgCO$_2$e continues. The addition of Bothell student housing in 2014 contributed to the decrease.

- Increased MgCO$_2$e 2014 Tacoma reduction is associated with warmer weather which decreases building heating energy demand.
Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast

Analysis: The UW may not be on target to reduce annual Scope 3 carbon footprint emissions to 15% below the 2005 baseline calendar year by 2020.

Why: The UW has reduced its Scope 3 carbon footprint emissions by reducing Seattle Campus commuting and professional travel relative to the 2005 baseline year.

Recommendations: Continued reduction in commuting and professional travel is required to meet UW’s carbon footprint reduction goal.

Forecast: The UW will not meet its carbon footprint reduction goal without continuing to reduce commuting and professional travel. However, the UW could decide to purchase Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) and/or carbon credits beginning 2020 to offset carbon footprint emissions in excess of its 15% carbon footprint reduction goal. Reducing commuting, professional travel, and energy use at off-campus medical facilities prior to 2020 will reduce or eliminate the need to purchase RECs and/or carbon credits in the future.

Measure Intent:
Estimating Scope 3 carbon emissions measures UW’s progress towards meeting its carbon footprint reduction goal. Scope 3 emissions originate from sources not classifiable as Scope 1 or 2. UW includes commuting, professional travel, and off-campus medical facilities in Scope 3.

Measure Formula / Description:
Annual percent metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent (MgCO₂e) emissions reduction is calculated by comparing estimated calendar year MgCO₂e emissions relative to estimated baseline calendar year 2005 emissions.
Scope 3 includes “other” emissions that are not classifiable as Scope 1 or 2. Scope 3 includes carbon emissions for which the UW wishes to take responsibility. These include commuting (students, faculty and staff); professional travel (air travel); Harborview Medical Center, and the Regional Primate Research Center AIDS research facility.

- Seattle commuting MgCO$_2$e reduction remains relatively stable.
- Professional travel MgCO$_2$e reduction remains relatively stable.
- Off-campus medical MgCO$_2$e reduction remains relatively stable.
Objective: P2 – Champion Environmental Stewardship

Measure: P2.4: Diversion Rate

Diversion rate is the key outcome indicator of success at promoting recycling and composting on the UW campus.

Waste Diversion Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2015</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2016</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis / Recommendations / Forecast

Analysis: The target for Q2 was not met. The waste diversion rate for Q2 was 62%. The fiscal year goal is 65%. Please note due to some data changes and their impact on our waste diversion reporting we have changed our fiscal year waste diversion goal to 65% rather than 68% as previously reported during the Q1 report out.

Why: Despite not meeting our target this quarter, our overall waste diversion rate is on an upward trend. We are still recycling/diverting more material than we are landfilling.

Recommendations: Continued collaboration with campus partners on targeted education programs and investment in infrastructural improvements to help improve overall recycling and compost collection infrastructure in residence halls, cafes, academic buildings and FMC shops and Corp Yard 2 facilities.

Forecast: The revised target for Fiscal Year 2016’s target is 65%. Given the results of the Cedar Grove route audit and the impact it had on our food waste estimate, we do not anticipate being able to reach our goal. As you will see on subsequent slides, the campus group UW Recycling has the most influence over in terms of increasing waste diversion, is also the group that is performing the best. Long-term waste diversion success will be dependent on different campus groups such as HFS, ICA and UWMC. A unified vision amongst all campus groups will be the most impactful in helping us reach our long-term waste diversion goals.

Measure Formula / Description:

The percentage of campus waste that is being diverted from landfill, accumulated through fiscal year.

Linked Initiatives/Activities

- Cedar Grove route audit of food waste weight by location (Q2 FY16)
- Improved collection of bulky materials in FMC shops (Q4 FY16)
- Conduct another University-wide waste characterization study (TBD)
**Objective:** P2 – Champion Environmental Stewardship

**Measure:** P2.4: Diversion Rate

**Owner:** Emily Newcomer

---

**What’s Driving our Diversion?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td><strong>1400</strong></td>
<td><strong>1200</strong></td>
<td><strong>1000</strong></td>
<td><strong>800</strong></td>
<td><strong>600</strong></td>
<td><strong>400</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2015</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2016</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Food Waste Estimate Results in Lower Food Waste Tonnage**

- The majority of our food waste tonnage data that is reported is not based on actual measured weights but is estimated using a volume to weight conversion factor. This is different from recycling and garbage which is based on actual measured weights.

- The volume to weight ratio of our reported food waste tonnage is provided by Cedar Grove, our contracted compost collection vendor. Cedar Grove established this volume to weight conversion factor in 2004 when we launched our compost program.

- The composition of the compost stream at the UW has changed since 2004, which impacts the accuracy of food waste data we have been using to report our waste diversion success.

- Committed to data integrity, UW Recycling took the initiative to remedy the data inaccuracy and conducted a route audit to establish a more accurate food waste estimate (an updated volume to weight ratio).

- The route audit showed that the new estimate is much lower than the estimate we had been using; 39% of the old weight estimate.

- What this means is had we been using the more accurate food waste estimate last year our waste diversion rate would have been closer to 61% rather than the 66% that was reported.

- The new food waste weight estimate will go into effect for fiscal year 2016 reporting and beyond. Moving forward, we will continue to conduct annual route audits to ensure our food waste estimates remain accurate.
When it comes to having an impact on waste diversion, UW Recycling has the most influence on the Academic/Facilities campus group. This campus group receives waste collection service by UW Recycling crew, the buildings are serviced by FS’ Custodial Services team, and disposal costs are covered by the utility budget. However, our waste diversion data also includes information from HFS, ICA and UWMC—three campus groups whose waste diversion programming have an impact on how we can reach our 70% waste diversion goal. Despite collaboration with these campus groups, our influence over their waste diversion programming is limited because they are self-sustaining and often times have different priorities.

As noted in the adjacent graph, the academic/facilities group has the highest waste diversion rate among all campus groups which means the remaining amount of garbage left to divert is small. Conversely, the other campus groups have lower waste diversion rates, meaning they have more opportunities to decrease the amount of garbage they are still generating.
Every quarter we track the disposal cost savings of our diversion efforts. In Q2 we diverted 1980 tons of material. Had we landfilled that material we would have spent an additional $119,100 on disposal costs.

Fluctuating net avoided disposal costs this quarter were driven by several things:

• Decrease in overall tons diverted (the result of receiving a more accurate food waste estimate)
• Operational equipment issues
• We were down 1 truck for most of the quarter meaning we had to co-mingle all recycling rather than run a separate paper route. We receive a rebate from paper when it is source-separated from other recycling so co-mingling means we lose that rebate.
• The metal rebate is at an industry low and we are receiving only $35/ton for material
• We are converting more buildings to all-in-one recycling thus our overall rebate/revenue earned for paper is decreasing.

We expect quarterly waste diversion cost avoidance will continue to be net positive however, the overall savings amount will probably not be as high as reported in previous months.
FACILITIES SERVICES
SERVING TODAY, PRESERVING TOMORROW

OUR MISSION
We learn, adapt and innovate to preserve physical assets and deliver best services.

OUR VISION
A world-class organization providing exceptional service anywhere, anytime.

OUR STRATEGY

ENHANCE CUSTOMER/STAKEHOLDER EXPERIENCE
Deliver a campus ready for business each day — Damian Fetters
Provide quality spaces and places — Gene Woodward

ELIMINATE ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN
Be easy to do business with — Josh Kavanagh

REDUCE COST / INCREASE REVENUE
Deliver cost effective services — James Angelosante

BUILD CAPACITY
Train and develop for excellence — Patricia Colaizzo
Create a safe and injury-free environment — Steve Charvat
Recognize and celebrate individual and team contributions — Patricia Colaizzo

EMBRACE INNOVATION
Engage all staff in continuous improvement — LuAnn Stokke
Champion environmental stewardship — John Chapman

OUR GuidING PRINCIPLES
Respect every individual
Create constancy of purpose
Lead with humility
Assure quality at the source
Create value for the customer

OUR VALUES
Trustworthy
Citizenship
Respect
Responsibility
Fair
Caring