

UAA Administrative Review Questionnaire – Spring 2020

Facilities and Campus Services

1) What are the core functions of your unit that are funded in Fund 1 (i.e. Fund 104110)? (Bullet point list is preferred. No more than one page, please.)

Facilities and Campus Services (FCS) is responsible for the core functions of maintenance and operations for the Anchorage Campus and the physical planning, construction, and reporting for UAA. Facilities functions are predominantly Fund 1, with some recharge activities.

- Facilities Maintenance
 - Reactive and Preventative Maintenance of the campus' electrical, mechanical, and structural systems. Skilled trades include: plumbing, HVAC, electrical, carpentry, painting, locksmith, roofing, building automation, refrigeration, and fire systems.
 - Management of service contracts for elevator maintenance; fire detection and suppression maintenance; water purity testing/treatment; overhead crane and lift maintenance; and building automation support and energy cost savings initiatives.
 - Repair of building interior and exterior structures and fixtures, the first response to building equipment, life safety equipment failures, ADA access, and natural disasters that impact campus.
- Facilities Operations
 - Management of service contractors for: snow plowing and removal; parking lot and road striping; asphalt patching and repairs.
 - Custodial Services - for all Anchorage property, except for the Alaska Airlines Center and Housing. The services are outsourced with 1.2 FTE in-house for contract management and customer coordination.
 - Campus Grounds Maintenance – maintenance and care of open spaces, roads, parking lots, sidewalks, and trails. Roadway and parking lot snow plowing has been outsourced, but in-house staff continue to plow walkways/trails and handle ice mitigation efforts. Horticulture services – interior and exterior plant management.
 - Fleet Maintenance – centralized maintenance of university fleet vehicles. Emergency Generator Maintenance Services. Small equipment repair, standby for Zamboni and backup resource for grounds. Currently part self-support (60%) and part UGF (40%).
 - Seawolf Shuttle - provides university transportation services for students, staff, and faculty with the bulk ridership generating in/out of Housing. These services fulfill critical ADA access needs throughout campus. These services are funded through student fees.
- Utilities Management
 - Anchorage Campus utilities are 95% UGF central funded and fixed cost for the campus that is managed by Facilities. The remainder is funded by campus auxiliaries. This approach has enabled Facilities personnel to better identify areas for reducing energy consumption and overall emissions of the campus, while ensuring the other Facilities activities do not bear the burden of utility rate increases. Utility savings are directed toward measures that improve energy efficiency.
- Facilities Planning and Construction (FPC)
 - FPC is responsible for planning, budgeting, contract management, and construction of professionally designed buildings and facilities for the UAA campus and its extended community campuses. The primary focus of FPC is to ensure new construction, renovations (large and small), alterations and deferred maintenance projects are implemented to support the mission of the university and that physical development meets academic program requirements in support of all UAA campuses.
 - Additionally, FPC is responsible for the campus Master Plan and Space Management
 - While predominantly recharge, some Planning and Construction personnel are unrestricted general funds (UGF).
- FCS is critical to supporting emergency preparedness and response coordination

- Campus Sustainability - FCS houses the administrative mission for campus sustainability, with a focus on energy efficiency and waste reduction
- Community interface and Agency Coordination
 - Regular interface with state and municipal departments, community councils, and utilities to mitigate project impacts to campus operations
 - Involvement with area planning efforts that have an impact on the Anchorage campus. (e.g., UMED District Plan, UMED Traffic Demand Management Study, Midtown Congestion Relief, MOA Land Use Plan, etc.)
- Central Support
 - Work Management is responsible for providing support to the maintenance, operations, and the campus community. The first point of contact in receiving work requests and notification with campus needs. Relays requests and emergencies to the staff in the field. Responsible for data entry of benchmarking and measurable performances.
 - Responsible for fiscal and cost center duties. Leverages the data collected to provide benchmarking and measure department performance.

2) If one or more of these functions was reduced or discontinued, what would be the impact on:

- a. More students persisting and completing educational goals?
- b. Supporting overall student, faculty and staff success in meeting UAA's mission?
- c. Impacts to UAA's reputation, and ability to attract and retain students and/or external support?

- Reduced safety and accessibility including downstream effects related to mission and reputation.
- Delayed service for maintenance, operations, and planning on campus which reduces our ability to support the programmatic mission, accreditation requirements, and ultimately impacts our students academic success. For example response to: hot/cold calls, plumbing leaks, roof leaks, unsafe conditions, and deteriorated aesthetics.
- The appearance of campus and grounds has a direct impact on individual recruitment decisions.
 - Campus environment was the top reason for selecting an institution – EAB 2017
<https://eab.com/insights/expert-insight/facilities/4-of-the-most-iconic-campus-landscapes-and-the-impact-they-have-on-students/>
 - The appearance of campus affects potential donor interest
 - Importance of indoor plants on winter mental health
- Reductions to the team weaken emergency response – emergencies over the past year have leveraged each part of the team. With several years of deferred capital needs, campus emergencies are becoming more prevalent requiring more internal resources for emergency response and safety-related operational and recovery strategies.
- Loss of coordination and compliance with regulatory agencies.

3) Identify measures and targets used to monitor the impact of functions on each of the above (not all elements may be relevant for your unit, only address relevant items).

Since FY12 Facilities and Campus Services has engaged the firm Sightlines for annual evaluation of UAA's maintenance, operations, and capital programs. This evaluation includes deep dives into staff coverages, comparisons to peer institutions, and assistance with developing targets. This data has been used to guide service adjustments and personnel allocations. In recent years, as part of the ongoing collaborations through the UA Facilities Council, we have expanded the use of sightlines data and are developing key performance measures across the University of Alaska system building portfolio as part of our overall effectiveness in facilities stewardship.

Notable measures include:

- Preventative Maintenance (PM) share of work orders

- Focusing on PM has been a top priority for the Maintenance team 60% of our work orders are related to prevention. Our peers average half of this at 30%.
- \$1 (prevention) spent now saves \$3 (Reactive Maintenance) later - EAB, APPA
- Density at UAA is: 345 users (FTE)/100,000 gross square feet (GSF), our peer average and the higher education facility average is 438 and 391 respectively.
- Classroom utilization ties directly to courses in classrooms where there are enrolled students
- Customer Service - via a survey as part of the Sightlines evaluation
- Energy Consumption and Cost Savings
- Facility Condition Index (Deferred Maintenance/Cost Replacement Value)
- Annual evaluation of the cost to operate at each building (Anchorage Campus Only), (Maintenance, Grounds, Custodial, and Utilities)
- FCS represents UAA on and currently chairs the UA Statewide Facilities Council championing system-wide initiatives such as streamline data administration, contract improvements, system-wide key performance indicators, and driving for continuous process improvement. Additionally, as a member of the Facilities Council FCS has led the charge in advocacy to the legislature for funding that can help not just maintain but improve our building environment ultimately supporting every facet of the University's mission.

These measures help to inform where best to invest capital dollars to get the best return on investment. These measures help us to know where to look for strategic operational modifications or investment decisions.

4) What improvements have been achieved over the last five years?

- Space Utilization: Shared use of resources and space compression relocating and reducing departmental space needs. Over 122,000 GSF sold, lease terminations, or freeing up of space to lease for revenue over the last 3 years. This fact has produced savings in maintenance and operations (M&O) and is creating a revenue source that offsets the cost implications of the related facility stewardship including deferred maintenance and renewal.
- Safety: Investment in safety with a focus on hazard mitigation, staff training, and code required safety initiatives and increased departmental accountability with the renewal of the Building Blitz program.
- Automation Initiatives and reducing administrative support while improving customer service
- Leveraging volunteers and departmental resources to increase customer care: building manager program
- Combined the Grounds and Horticulture teams into one integrated operation. Reduction in the management structure. This has increased the bench strength for both needs, allowing us to better shift resources based on needs. This nimbleness has enabled the team to ensure quality grounds and interior plants with reduced staff.
- Energy savings through project investments, continuous lighting upgrades, and through recommissioning of buildings leveraging building automation setpoints. These energy consumption reductions have helped to offset the rising cost of energy.
 - 154,905 BTU/GSF in 2014 to 108,157 BTU/GSF in 2019. This energy stewardship translates to a net annual savings of \$2.9M/year based on 2019 energy costs.
- In response to our obligation to provide accessibility in and to our learning environments, we place an emphasis on equitable design of our spaces and on the built environments.

5) What efforts have your unit made to improve efficiencies and reduce costs? What was the result?

Reduced staff positions across the department – realigned duties across fewer people to ensure continued execution
Impact: staff are stretched thin. Critical areas are 1 or 2 people deep. There is a delay in the performance of service work. There is a greater reliance on contracting services that may not be the most cost-effective way to accomplish the work. These delays and higher cost implications are a frustration for our customers. Overall these staffing reductions have resulted in \$1.63M savings to the UGF budget over the last 5 years.

- Maintenance Staff Reductions.
 - Staff spend time fixing outdated systems that are obsolete and no longer supported by the manufacturer. Time is spent trying to find parts only to find that the parts must be fabricated in house

to keep some systems operational. Repeatedly repairing obsolete equipment requires resources needed for other important objectives, causes frustration, and impacts the morale of our technical staff. They often repair/rebuild what they know should be replaced. These efforts almost always end up involving our most skilled tradespersons.

- Result: Maintenance staff reduced by 9 FTEs
- Outsourced snow plowing. This was a cost-neutral decision that improved in-house maintenance staff resilience and service capabilities during normal operational hours. The prior model was a volunteer snow removal structure. This was risky (staff fatigue) and failing due to labor constraints.
- Combined Fleet and Shuttle teams into one integrated team. Reduction in management structure; Fleet and Transportation under one supervisor. Eliminated summer shuttle and reduced shuttle service to Aviation Campus; additional reductions to Shuttle service hours resulted in reduced ability to provide after-hours charter services for Athletics.
 - Route reductions provided for commodity and maintenance savings of \$72K. Commodity market fluctuations, major equipment repairs negated savings.
 - Reduced from two separate shops for Fleet and Shuttle into one operation. Staffing went from 2 supervisors to 1 supervisor; additional combined shop staffing reductions 4.5 FTEs.
- Reduced custodial support – less frequent office cleaning; deferral of window cleaning; deferral of carpet cleaning in departmental space; employees must empty their own trash; reduction of in-house personnel from 7 FTE to 1.2 FTE (previously included 3 FTE focused on contract QA and customer relations)
 - Result: Contractual savings in the amount of \$1.8M annually due to reduction in service scope
- Reduced from two separate shops for Grounds and Horticulture into one integrated operation. Staffing went from 2 supervisors, 8 12-month benefitted, and 16+ full-time summer temps to 1 supervisor, 6 12-month employees, and 6 full-time summer temps.
 - Impact: fewer flower beds; less frequent lawn mowing and watering; less frequent service of indoor plants; smaller team to manage ice; inability to replace aging exterior fixtures, such as trash cans and picnic tables.
 - Impact: Overall lowering of the campus appearance. Concerns about appearance have been raised by enrollment consultants, the vendor that helped with the virtual tours, the campus recruitment team, and donors.
 - Recruitment impact - Cite: EAB 2017 survey, campus environment top variable; SEM Quarterly Nov 2018, the importance of campus tours and physical appearance
- Process improvements and strategic allocation of funds to lessen the time for work, where possible
 - Access hatches, greater leveraging of work order system, deploying customer-central tools (AiM Ready), improvements to our project management system (eBuilder), and a movement toward electronic files reducing storage needs and improving accessibility.
- Facilities Planning and Construction Staff Reductions
 - Result: Facilities Planning and Construction staff reduced by 5 FTE's
 - Reduced staff results in an increasing project workload for remaining members of the team. Currently, FPC has 3 project managers (PM) and 1 associate project manager (APM). FPC averages 140-160 projects per FY, which is roughly 35-40 projects on average per PM/APM. According to an EAB survey of 36 higher educational institutions, the average project manager workload is 13 projects, and the median 7.3 projects. This results in reduced response time, impacts to effective project communication, and a reduced capacity to administer the details. Ultimately this impacts our ability to effectively meet our communities needs which have a direct impact on our students, faculty, and staff.

6) List and briefly describe any current or proposed Board of Regents Policy, State or Federal mandates, or laws that require the continuation of your core function(s).

Facilities and Campus Services is charged with ensuring compliance with essential building and life/safety code requirements necessary for buildings to be occupiable.

- Examples include: Federal, State, and Municipal requirements and building codes; NFPA fire code; International Building Code; AKOSH/OSHA standards; ADA requirements; EPA Clean Air Act, EPA Clean Water Act, Federal Motor Carrier Standards (FMCSA)
- Code requirements and jurisdictional department examples include: MOA Planning, Building Safety, Zoning, Traffic, and Fire Departments; SOA Depts Public Safety Fire Marshal Office, Labor Workforce Development Labor Standards and Safety Division, Natural Resources, Environmental Conservation, Transportation and Public Facilities.
- Primary Board Policy and Regulations: 05.11 (Real Property) and 05.12 (Capital Planning and Facilities Management), for all UAA campuses and properties
- Additional BOR policies FCS has a hand in: 05.01, 05.04, 05.06, 05.09
- NWCCU 2020 Standards: standard 2.I.1 and Eligibility Requirement 15
- OMB Circular A-21 Cost Principles for Educational Institutions, specifically the facility component and space.

7) Potential cuts: Please describe any function reductions or eliminations that are feasible without significantly affecting UAA’s mission fulfillment or its compliance mandates? Are any functions within your unit duplicated elsewhere at UAA? Is there an opportunity for efficiency to be created by partnering or combining functions? Please describe the opportunities you identify within your unit and include the approximate dollar values and savings that would result.

Potential Cuts:

1. Space Opportunities. In a review of our critical services, our costs, recent equipment failures due to lack of investment in the replacement of critical building infrastructure coupled with several years of accumulated cuts, we propose as a first priority to continue to lease or sell off-campus properties reducing our liability for our Operations, Maintenance, and Deferred Maintenance backlog. This initiative also creates opportunities in our campus core to better utilize space and offer more efficiencies for students, faculty, and staff who require access and interface for these services.
 - University Center 95,000 GSF valued at \$14M with several million identified liability in deferred maintenance backlog. Currently roughly 50% vacant with planned relocations of additional UAA departments throughout the 2020 calendar year. Total costs for debt payment and ongoing maintenance and operations is roughly \$1.4M annually. Continue to pursue lease opportunities and finalize interest with several state entities and non-profit companies.
 - 1901 Bragaw Office Complex 69,000 GSF valued at \$15.6M with several million in identified liability in deferred maintenance backlog as well as \$375,000 annually in UGF identified for costs related to maintenance and operations.
 - University Center Warehouse Lease 9900 GSF valued at \$146,000/annually in the lease, maintenance and operations costs. Locating this function on campus would produce operational savings in lost time due to travel. Maintenance staff travel to this warehouse on average 25 trips per week. The lease could be terminated early with 6 months advance notice and could be effective in FY22. This warehouse is shared with Surplus and IT with a split of facilities at 60% and others at 40%.
2. 10% Reduction in UGF Facilities Budget would translate to a proposed cut of \$840k. This value excludes utilities which are managed by facilities but are centrally funded. We propose a 10% reduction in the Facilities Reserve budget (104110-17038). Many of these reductions will have an effect on safety and campus response time. Reductions in this area could mean prolonged closures that effect mission.

Example of this budget reduction could impact the following levels of service:

 - Critical spare parts on hand for emergency repairs. Building components or systems may have to be shut off or run at a limited capacity until funding or parts are made available. An impact on campus safety and accessibility.
 - Funding to buy critical parts to fix building components/systems, including tools. An impact on campus safety and accessibility.

- Fatigue and burnout on maintenance staff not having the parts and equipment available. An impact on employee safety or well being.
 - Preventative maintenance cycles may have to be increased. Monthly or quarterly scheduled routine maintenance may move to a semi-annual or annual schedule or typical parts that get replaced could be used past its normal operating life. Short-term it would suffice. Long-term may impact the useful life of the system. An impact on campus safety, accessibility, and affordability.
 - Light bulbs that fail, may not get replaced or only a fraction of bulbs to provide adequate lighting. An impact on campus safety and accessibility.
 - Filters within building Air Handling units would be replaced less frequently impacting air quality and employee health.
 - Sidewalks and paths may see a reduced sanding/ice-melt schedule. An impact on campus safety.
 - Reduced materials for grounds would impact the overall look and impression of the campus.
 - Ability to provide additional custodial cleaning as needed
3. Move Fleet Services to 100% self-support. The cost of fleet operation is \$450k of this \$180k is funded by UGF at this time.
- Fleet Services is about 40% UGF and 60% self-support. Moving to 100% self-support would better appropriate operational costs to departments with fleet vehicles. This would increase the shop rate from \$60/hr to \$90/hr. This proposed rate is less than comparable third party shop rates.
 - It would require a broader evaluation of whether departments can utilize off-campus fleet maintenance.
 - A cost shift rather than complete reduction.

Broader Input needed:

- Launch Task Force to assess current Transportations services and recommend next steps
 - Transportation services are currently split between Facilities and Parking. Facilities operates the Seawolf Shuttle, which Parking funds through their revenue streams (Transportation Fee, permit sales, etc.). In addition, Parking operates the U-PASS program.
 - The U-PASS and V-PASS costs Parking roughly \$120,000/year and the Seawolf Shuttle is \$375,000/year, all through Auxiliary revenue
 - In 2019 Parking sought an increase to the Transportation Fee to better fund these activities without using permit revenue. The increase was not approved, but it was clear that a campus-wide discussion was needed on the future of transportation programs, their funding, and their structure.

Areas of Relatedness:

- Explore whether Parking Services should report through Facilities and Campus Services
 - Facilities and Parking both have significant roles in the maintenance and operations of campus roads, parking lots, parking garages, trails, and the shuttle service, with Facilities handling the physical components and Parking handling the financial and enforcement components. Facilities and Parking share ownership of UAA's physical access mission. Both ensure easy and safe access for all of our students, faculty, staff, and visitors. This focus is reinforced by the 2016 SP+ report and UAA 2020.
 - Parking staff has many of the programmatic components of the campus' transportation and parking demand management strategies, implementing key traffic flow components and exterior wayfinding of the Campus Master Plan. Additionally, in 2015 Facilities negotiated a variance with MOA on how the campus' parking requirements are calculated. Facilities and Parking both have a piece of maintaining this agreement.
 - As stated above, the Seawolf Shuttle is also split between our two departments.
- Explore whether General Support Services (GSS) should report through Facilities and Campus Services
 - FCS and GSS have several related campus operational services. Examples include: furniture and relocation (FPC, Maintenance, Surplus); waste management and diversion (Custodial, Sustainability, and Recycling); and, vehicle management and disposal.

- Potential synergies exist between FCS and GSS' Copy and Print function in regards to indoor signage and wayfinding.
- Explore whether centralized Fleet Management could increase vehicle usage and provide overall improvements to equipment stewardship. Considerations or benefits could explore:
 - Standardizing vehicle specifications/purchases creates operational efficiencies with reduced inventory and reduced maintenance of specialty equipment and training costs.
 - Ability to maximize asset utilization resolving issues surrounding no-to-low use vehicle PM requirements and dead-battery calls; underutilized vehicles can be scheduled for use or disposed of; implementation of an appropriate vehicle replacement plan; decreased insurance coverage costs based on "right-sized" fleet approach.
 - Timely repairs (damage, general inspections/walk-a-rounds); assets are properly maintained and retain appropriate valuation.
 - Improved driver experience addressed through the implementation of cleanliness standards, maintenance and repair standards, fuel/service assurity resulting in minimized downtime for drivers.

Areas of Duplications:

- AAC custodial services
 - We have outsourced this function through the AAC operations agreement with Spectra as a management strategy. However, we could benefit from a periodic review of the financial cost considerations to see if this is still the best strategy for UAA.
- Housing Maintenance and Custodial Services:
 - Organizationally, this rolls up under Student Affairs and is limited to general maintenance and custodial services at the student housing complex.
 - FCS provides services for project renovations and for technical services related to maintenance and repair services including elevator, fire, HVAC and electrical. We provide approximately \$175K in annual support.
 - There may be a strategic advantage to leave these services decentralized allowing Student Affairs control over these services. However, we could benefit from a periodic review of the financial and risk considerations related to this organizational structure.