Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of the Minutes from December 1st, 2016
4. Chair’s remarks
5. Deferred Maintenance - Mike McCormick, AVP Capital Planning and Development / Charles Kennedy, AVP Facilities Services
7. Good of the Order
8. Adjourn

1) Call to Order

Christie called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2) Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as written.

3) Approval of the Minutes from December 1st, 2016

The minutes from December 1st, 2016 were approved as written.

4) Chair’s remarks

The FCUFS Class C Resolution Concerning General Assignment Classrooms was approved by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and will be discussed/voted on by the faculty senate in its next meeting.

Construction on the new Computer Science & Engineering (CSE) II building has begun.

The UW Architectural Commission is working out site selection for the new Population Health Facility. The decision will be finalized by the time of the April 2017 Board of Regents (BoR) meeting.

On February 16th, FCUFS will hold its annual Transportation Services/parking meeting; the new head of UW Transportation Services will be invited to attend.
Christie reported he has made an inquiry with the Faculty Senate & Governance Office to learn about the status of adding members for tri-campus FCUFS. He noted he would report back to the council on this topic.

5) Deferred Maintenance - Mike McCormick, AVP Capital Planning and Development / Charles Kennedy AVP Facilities Services (Exhibit 1)

Christie explained faculty senate leadership asked FCUFS to investigate the status of the university’s deferred maintenance of physical structures at the UW Seattle campus. The topic was largely disseminated to the larger public via an article in the Seattle Times stating that the UW has “$1 billion dollars in deferred maintenance.” He noted this topic does not coincide with custodial effort.

Kennedy (president’s designee) and Mike McCormick (Associate Vice President, Capital Planning & Development) were present to give more information on deferred maintenance at the university; they used a PowerPoint as part of their presentation (Exhibit 1).

Data was shown compiled by independent analytical firm Sightlines - a company hired by UW in academic year 2015-2016. The company offers facilities cataloging, analysis, forecasting, performance measurement, planning services, as well as physical infrastructure data and trends on hundreds of universities nationwide. “Space,” “Capital”, and “Operations” are the three main elements evaluated by Sightlines. All three are interconnected, and combined they provide a holistic view of a campus.

The guests explained there is a manageable level of deferred maintenance that many universities sustain nationwide. The UW has more deferred maintenance than is average, and currently UW’s asset reinvestment need is higher than many of its peers. It was noted to prevent further obsolescence in the systems and to meet needs over a ten-year period, the UW needs to invest roughly $91 million annually (Slide 7, Exhibit 1). McCormick noted the goal is to sit in between increasing net asset value and increasing backlog and risk. Currently, the UW is not within that range, and not as healthy by this metric compared to peers (Slide 8, Exhibit 1).

It was noted that one of the causes for the amount of deferred maintenance is that the institution has historically under-invested in maintenance, and maintenance work rarely receives donated funding. A member noted that other universities seem to assign funding for expenses like maintenance through various internal and external mechanisms creating reliable support.

A member suggested that to make these financial needs more apparent, the guests might consider listing some real effects deferred maintenance is having on the university’s basic ability to execute its academic mission. Another member noted pictures of maintenance issues might make the physical effect of the budgetary issues more apparent.

It was noted a good way to influence funding for deferred maintenance is through the One Capital Plan.

Christie noted his understanding is that the UW has systematically under-prioritized maintenance. He noted at this point, deferred maintenance ceases to be an FCUFS issue and starts becoming a Senate
Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCP/B) issue, where there is expertise to analyze university budgetary matters.

The council agreed to endorse a new systematic approach to allocating funding for deferred maintenance.

McCormick and Kennedy were thanked for updating the council on the state of deferred maintenance.

6) Landscape Maintenance - Kristine Kenney, University Landscape Architect / Howard Nakase, Facilities Maintenance and Construction (Exhibit 2)

Howard Nakase (Manager of Grounds Operations & Building Envelope, Facilities Maintenance & Construction) and Kristine Kenney (University Landscape Architect, Office of The University Architect) explained they have joined the council to present on the current state of landscape maintenance at the UW. They used a PowerPoint as part of their presentation.

Nakase explained he manages the UW grounds crew. In 2008, a hiring freeze at the university due to reduced state support resulted in fewer grounds crew employees. Around the same time, several new facilities and 20 new acres of grounds were added to the university, creating a maintenance shortfall.

A university-wide survey asked people what their favorite UW landscape is. A map was shown dotting their responses (Exhibit 2).

The guests explained levels of care for university landscapes are often classified on a scale of 1-6; level 1 areas are high-visibility well-groomed landscapes, and level 6 encompasses more or less naturalized wilderness. The rubric was applied to a map of UW Seattle, excluding levels 1 and 6 as those were not thought to be present on campus. The guests noted the greatest effort have been put into iconic landscapes (e.g. the Quad and Rainier Vista). Using this method, university grounds can be supported by the level of FTE the grounds crew has at its disposal.

Kenney showed a list of capital projects to revise the landscape and ultimately improve operating costs by providing new landscape infrastructure (Exhibit 2). Christie recommended showing the net economic benefit for the investments shown in order to make a stronger case. Whittington noted a other way to show the benefit would be an estimated increased acreage of land which could be managed by the current level of grounds crew if these investments were made.

The guests showed various photos of UW landscapes as they evolved during the period 2010-2015. There was some discussion of specific areas that changed over time. The Rainer Vista, for example, went up from 1 FTE to 1.9 FTE after its renovation (for necessary grounds upkeep). Kenney emphasized that new acreage requires a three-year “establishment period” wherein a high amount of upkeep is required, and after which the grounds become increasingly self-sustained. After some discussion, several council members noted money spent on the Rainer Triangle was well-spent given its functional and aesthetic benefit to the campus.
There was some talk of outside volunteer groups or student-led groups helping with landscape management and maintenance at the UW. It was noted these sources of upkeep are immensely helpful but do not provide a long-term solution.

Christie noted there is a good argument for increased support for landscape maintenance given the influx of new buildings and other capital projects.

The council thanked the guests for presenting.

7) Good of the Order

Nothing was stated for the good of the order.

8) Adjourn

Christie adjourned the meeting at 11:27 a.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: Faculty: Bruce Balick, Rich Christie (chair), Laura Little, Murray Maitland, Bill Rorabaugh, AnnMarie Borys, Jan Whittington
Ex-officio reps: Chris Byrne
President’s designee: Charles Kennedy
Guests: Mike McCormick, Kristine Kenney, Howard Nakase

Absent: Faculty: Ann Mescher, Giovanni Migliaccio, Ashley Emery
Ex-officio reps: Carly Bainbridge, John Carroll, Steve Goldblatt, JoAnn Taricani

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – UW Adjusted ROPA+ Slides v2.pdf
Exhibit 2 – Landscape maintenance at UW.pdf
Who Partners with Sightlines?

Robust membership includes colleges, universities, consortiums and state systems.

Serving the Nation’s Leading Institutions:
- 70% of the Top 20 Colleges*
- 75% of the Top 20 Universities*
- 34 Flagship State Universities
- 14 of the 14 Big 10 Institutions
- 9 of the 12 Ivy Plus Institutions

Sightlines is proud to announce that:
- 450 colleges and universities are Sightlines clients including over 325 ROPA members.
- Consistently over 90% member retention rate
- We have clients in over 40 states, the District of Columbia and four Canadian provinces
- More than 125 new institutions became Sightlines members since 2013

Sightlines advises state systems in:
- Alaska
- California
- Florida
- Hawaii
- Maine
- Massachusetts
- Minnesota
- Mississippi
- Missouri
- Nebraska
- New Hampshire
- New Jersey
- Pennsylvania
- Texas

* U.S. News 2016 Rankings
Using ROPA+ to Change the Conversation

- **SPACE**: Release the hidden value in balance sheets
- **CAPITAL $**: Multiyear plans that align to mission and risk
- **OPERATIONS**: Improve effectiveness and lower facilities overhead impact
Putting Your Campus Building Age in Context

The campus age drives the overall risk profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-War</th>
<th>Post-War</th>
<th>Modern</th>
<th>Complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built before 1951</td>
<td>Built from 1951 to 1975</td>
<td>Built from 1976 to 1990</td>
<td>Built in 1991 and newer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable construction</td>
<td>Lower-quality construction</td>
<td>Quick-flash construction</td>
<td>Technically complex spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older but typically lasts longer</td>
<td>Already needing more repairs and renovations</td>
<td>Low-quality building components</td>
<td>Higher-quality, more expensive to maintain &amp; repair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 1: Sightlines Database - Construction Age

Exhibit 1: Composite

The graph shows the distribution of building ages over time, with Post-War, Modern, and Complex categories highlighted.
Growth by Ownership Group

Waves of construction can predict future need & growth

Exhibit 1
## Defining Washington’s Funding Sources

### Annual Stewardship

- **The annual investment needed to ensure buildings will properly perform and reach their useful life**

  **“Keep-Up Costs”**

- **Annual Stewardship Funding**
  - Preventative Maintenance
  - Minor Capital Projects (State Funds)

### Asset Reinvestment

- **The accumulation of repair and modernization needs and the definition of resource capacity to correct them**

  **“Catch-Up Costs”**

- **Asset Reinvestment Funding**
  - Minor Capital Projects (Local Funds)
  - Major Capital Funds
Defining an Annual Investment Target

Annual Funding Target: $91M for E&G Facilities

FY16 Annual Investment Target

- $192.0 3% Replacement Value
- $96.6 Life Cycle Need
- $33.8 Annual Investment Target

- $76.4 Envelope/Mechanical
- $57.3 Space/Program

Functional obsolescence drives investment prior to life cycles & discounts the annual investment target.

Replacement Value: $6.4B
Historically Increasing Risk

E&G Need Only

Increasing Net Asset Value

Lowering Risk Profile

Increasing Backlog & Risk
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Exhibit 1

8
Stewardship Below Peer Investment Levels

FY2016 Comparison

Annual Stewardship Target Spend

E&G Peers

Research Peers

% of AS Target

Annual Stewardship Target Spend

% of AS Target
Total Capital Investment vs. Funding Target

Increasing Net Asset Value

Lowering Risk Profile

Increasing Backlog & Risk

- **Annual Stewardship**
- **Asset Reinvestment**
- **Infrastructure**
- **Annual Investment Target**
- **Life Cycle Need**
Adjusting the Total Backlog of Need

Total Asset Reinvestment Need

E&G Facilities & Campus Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Need</td>
<td>$1,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Portfolio</td>
<td>$256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted 10 Year Need</td>
<td>$1,621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROPA+ Prediction: Developing Strategy

Adjusted Need Based on Transition Portfolio

Discovery (Asset Reinvestment)

Prediction (Capital Risk)

Modernization & Infrastructure

Renewal Need

Current Need

$1,621

$400

$266

$955

Adjusted Need Based on Transition Portfolio
Washington’s AR Need is Higher than Peers

Total Asset Reinvestment Need

E&G Peers

Research Peers

More Deferred Maintenance

Exhibit 1
APPA : Leadership in Educational Facilities

They survey educational institutions to define maintenance standards for universities to compare themselves against.

APPA Standard: *Levels of Care are based on the number of maintenance activities being used and their frequency.*

---

1. High Visibility
2. The Norm
3. Sub-Standard
4. Declining Landscape
5. Naturalized Area
6. Wilderness
MY PLACES SURVEY: 1,943 Participants

Exhibit 2
ICONIC LANDSCAPES
OTHER LANDSCAPES

- Iconic Landscapes
- Other Landscapes
- Not managed by Grounds

Exhibit 2
NEW LEVELS OF CARE
BALANCING PRIORITIES

Exhibit 2
CURRENT TRENDS

2008

Landscape Management Need

2010 - 2016 20+ Upgrade Acres

PACCAR Hall
Ethnic Cultural Center
Terry Hall
Lander Hall
Poplar Hall
Mercer Court
Intellectual House
Molecular Engineering
Alder Hall
Elm Hall
Cedar Hall
Dempsey Hall
Rainier Vista
Burke Gilman Trail
Police Station
Denny Hall

2013

Grounds Crew

2017 +

NANO Engineering
ARCF
North Campus Housing
Life Science Building
Burke Museum
Physics Astronomy
Wallace Hall
1. Balance level of care landscape types across campus, maintaining current FTE, prioritizing iconic landscapes

2. Renew landscapes with high levels of maintenance requirements to simplify plantings and/or reduce labor

3. Balance level of care landscapes with new construction

4. Provide temporary FTE for plant establishment period for new projects
1. **AIM Work Order Data**  Hours / Task / Zone
2. **APPA Data**
3. **Staff Survey**
4. **Peer Institutions**
   - Michigan State University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW (AIM)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPA</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW (AIM)</td>
<td>26.1 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPA</td>
<td>56.0 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>26.5 FTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HARDSCAPE MAINTENANCE COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW (AIM)</td>
<td>1.21 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPA</td>
<td>6.1 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>6.4 - 4.5 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>FTE Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW (AIM)</td>
<td>28.2 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPA</td>
<td>62.5 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>36.9 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING UW</strong></td>
<td><strong>26 FTE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>