

Peer Review - Institutional Planning Models

1. What is your planning department's mission statement?

University of Colorado at Boulder (UCB): To create a campus environment which supports the creation, advancement and transfer of knowledge.

Arizona State University (ASU): To provide customer-focused, high quality facilities and services to support the mission of the University.

Colorado State University (CSU): Our mission is to anticipate and provide the physical environment, which enables Colorado State University to achieve its objectives in instruction, research, and public service.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT): The Department of Facilities provides the physical environment, utilities and support services necessary to promote the educational research activities of the Institute.

Stanford: It is a goal of the University to obtain the highest quality of physical environment to support academic programs, consistent with financial constraints and external regulations.

University of Arizona: The mission of the Department of Campus and Facilities Planning is to provide the University of Arizona with efficient, customer-oriented, professional planning services in support of the short and long range development of the campus physical and spatial environment. To efficiently and cost effectively provide a quality environment and facilities to support the University's teaching, research, and community service missions, and enhance the experience of all who interact with the University of Arizona.

University of Denver: Facilities Management and Planning supports the University's mission by providing an aesthetic, clean, orderly, safe and healthy environment in which to learn, teach, work and live.

University of New Mexico: To support the institution's education, research and public service mission by the planning and construction of facilities.

University of Utah: The administration and operation of all support services should efficiently support the teaching, research and service components of an institution's mission. The Facilities planning Department Mission Statement reflects the underlying philosophy that the Department's primary role is one of service to the academic community.

University of Virginia: Our mission is to provide timely, cost effective, quality facilities management for the University. To provide architectural, administration, and real estate and space administrative support to the University community.

University of Washington: (*Does not have a specific planning department. Their Engineering Services department is comparable.*) The mission of Engineering Services is to provide professional engineering support for the design, construction, operation and maintenance of all University facilities to assure teaching, research and public service programs.

University of Wisconsin: The Division of Facilities Planning and Management is committed to delivering customer focused service and providing stewardship of the campus infrastructure. The mission of FP & M is to provide a physical environment, which supports learning, working, living, and playing.

2. Describe the scope of responsibilities for the following departments, and include whether the services are provided to both general and auxiliary operations.

Facilities Management:

UCB: UCB Department of Facilities Management is responsible for physical plant maintenance and operations of buildings and grounds, custodial, recycling, and solid waste disposal services, construction project management, facilities and utilities engineering, planning, support services for the above, financial and human services.

ASU: All of the following services fall under the umbrella of our Facilities Management department: Planning, Construction, and Operations and Maintenance. We provide services to all educational/academic units and the majority of auxiliaries (for a charge-back); however, the auxiliaries can outsource if they can provide evidence that it is in their best interest.

CSU: The Facilities Management department consists of the following sub-units: Facilities Design & Construction, Operations Management, Planning/Property Management and Data & Information Systems, Accounting & Personnel, Administrative Support, Customer Services, and Development/Training. Services are for general funded programs. We have fee-for-service work, on occasion, for auxiliary services. Housing and Food Services, Lory Student Center, and the Student Recreation Center, all maintain their own maintenance staff and call our organization in on a fee-for-service basis, as needed.

MIT: Facilities Management includes all areas of Facilities, i.e., the operational areas of Custodial Services, Repair and Maintenance, Grounds and Mail Services, along with Design and Construction, and Utilities (including a Central Utilities Co-Generation Plant). Facilities Management also includes the administration units of Administration, Human Resources, Learning and Performance, Space Administration and Space Accounting, Finance and Accounting, and Information Technology.

Stanford: Facilities Operations is headed by the Associate Vice-Provost for Facilities. Operations consists of the office of the Associate Director of Facilities Operations for Utilities, Parking and Transportation Services, Grounds, Building Maintenance, Construction Services, Facilities Information & Technology, Zone Management, the Work Support Group, the Finance Group, and the Administrative Support Group, the latter of which reports to the Associate Vice-Provost.

University of Denver: Facilities Management and Planning is responsible for preventive, controlled and emergency maintenance, campus operations (grounds and irrigation, and snow removal), cleaning of facilities, hazardous waste removal, remodeling and capital construction, and real property management.

University of Utah: The Facilities Management organization serves under the Vice President for Administrative Services. The following departments are led by the Assistant Vice President for Administrative Services for Facilities: Facilities Planning, Plant Operations, Campus Design & Construction, Environmental Health & Safety, and Public Safety.

University of Virginia: Facilities Management includes the following departments: Facilities Planning and Construction (FP&C), Facilities Operations, a Medical Center Physical Plant, Utilities, and Business Management, Training and Human Resources. Facilities Management's professional, customer-conscious craftspeople, mechanics, service crews, architects, engineers, technicians, and others are well trained in their fields to provide support for the University Academic and Health Sciences Center divisions. We build, repair and maintain facilities.

University of Wisconsin: The Physical Plant is responsible for maintenance and upkeep of buildings, vehicles, grounds, and campus utilities. Design resources, construction trades and specialized facilities services are available for departmental requests and remodeling projects on a not-for-profit chargeback basis.

Describe the scope of responsibilities for the following departments, and include whether services are provided to general fund and auxiliary operations.

Planning:

UCB: The Planning Office provides services to both general and auxiliary operations. Small project design is usually designated to the construction office. The office is responsible for campus master planning, including institutional planning assessment, space needs analysis, short and long-range development planning, outdoor area planning, transportation planning; capital facilities planning, including compliance with state and university rules regarding capital development; management of capital projects from inception through design development; urban design

consistency and quality, including landscaping and building exteriors; outdoor signage design; preparation of planning documents, including program plans; selection and supervision of planning and architecture consultants.

Arizona State: We provide planning services to academic and general use clients and auxiliaries if requested. We have just recently started to try and get all units together to discuss strategic planning of facilities with an eye to the overall University's good, rather than what's just good for each unit. We have a way to go to break away from the territorial mindset.

Colorado State University: The planning department is one section within the overall Facilities Management Department. With the exception of planning, all services are only for general funded programs. We do have fee for service work on occasion for auxiliary services. Housing and Food Services, Lory Student Center and Student Recreation Center all maintain their own maintenance staff and call our organization in on a fee for service basis as needed. All design and construction services on campus are required to go through the Facilities Management Department. These services are completed on a fee for service basis for auxiliaries. All campus planning (master plan, program plans, state budget requests) are coordinated through Facilities Management. These services are 100 percent general funded.

Note: The planning section is responsible for the overall coordination of campus planning issues. All recommendations for assignment of reallocation of general funded space are processed through the planning section.

Stanford: The Planning Office is responsible for short and long range planning for Stanford lands and buildings. Included in this responsibility are landscape design, land use, and circulation.

1. **General University Responsibilities:** Ongoing liaison with neighboring political jurisdictions concerning land use, support of University committees, design review of building proposals.
2. **Private Housing:** When requested, site development and architectural review of plans for private housing on lands leased from the University.
3. **Stanford Linear Accelerator Center:** The University Architect/Director of Planning reviews plans for building and landscape development at SLAC to ensure conformance with design policies established by the Board of Trustees. The fee for services becomes part of the administrative costs included in the approved total project budget,

University of Arizona: (Planning is under Facilities Design and Construction here.) Planning consists of a team of design professionals, construction managers, cost control and contract specialists who represent the campus. They guide clients through the facilities development process, and coordinate consultants and contractors needed to complete projects. From initial concept planning and budgeting to occupancy, they help clients meet changing facilities needs.

University of California at San Diego: Capital Planning and Budget (BP&B) coordinates the State and non-State minor and major capital improvement programs and prepares documentation. Staff assistance is provided to Building Advisory Committees that are convened for each major capital project. Capital Planning organizes project-related interactions with numerous campus units and committees, including the Capital Outlay and Space Advisory Committee (COSAC). Data maintained include the official campus facilities inventory and space need analyses, reported annually to the UC Office of the President (UCOP), and the Capital Project Database. CP&B is responsible for long-range facility planning in support of the five year State and non-State capital programs, the preparation of capital needs statements, and system-wide planning efforts. CP&B coordinates a wide range of space and facility planning activities with special emphases placed on the development of information contained in capital improvement project planning documents.

University of Utah: The Facilities Planning Department consists of a director, staff architect/planner and an administrative assistant. The department is responsible for the development, implementation and updating of the University's Long Range Development plan (20-30 years). The long-range plan is based upon the strategic and academic plan for the University and was developed through a public participation process. In the actualization of these plans, Facilities Planning assists all colleges and campus departments in assisting their facilities needs and in developing requests for new facilities and major remodels. Assistance is provided in developing project scopes, descriptions and preliminary cost estimates for the purposes of administrative approvals, fund raising, and the Capital Development approval process. Site evaluations and selection processes are directed by Facilities Planning within the parameters of the LRDP.

Each year Facilities Planning, in coordination with University Administration and the Utah State Division of Facilities Construction and Management (DFCM) develop proposals for both state funded and non-state funded project

requests within the Capital Budget Request System for State Legislative approval. Capital Development projects consist of those projects with total costs equal to or greater than one million dollars.

Facilities Planning also develops scope and budget information and submits project requests for state-funded capital improvement projects. Capital Improvement projects must have total costs under one million dollars and include categories of general improvements, life safety, asbestos, roofing and paving. New building or remodeling projects do not qualify for this source of funding. Facilities Planning is responsible for project management of programming for all new buildings and major remodels. Consulting architects and engineers are selected through established procurement processes to provide programming and design services.

Facilities Planning works in coordination with the consultants and with the department of Campus Design and Construction throughout the programming, schematic design, design development and construction phases. The department also coordinates monthly open forum community meetings to inform the on and off-campus community of facilities projects on the campus. Projects in the conceptual, planning, programming, design and/or construction phases are discussed. The monthly meetings provide an opportunity to invite input from community members on the implementation of the LDRP through specific projects. The department produces a monthly newsletter which summarizes these meetings and offers updates on facilities projects. Currently, the distribution of the newsletter is about 550 copies to departments and individuals on and off campus.

University of Virginia: The Facilities Planning and Construction Department of Facilities Management provides the professional support in the planning and budget phase for each capital project considered for funding and/or authorization, and provides support for the various internal reviews. Responsibilities include management of programming, planning (including individual project planning and design), and construction of all University facilities. Project management is the primary effort. FP&C project managers provide all support in developing project-specific requirements, scopes and costs in the planning and budget phase, prepare all formal budget submissions, and execute the approved projects through the design, procurement, and construction phases. Additionally, they execute all non-capital projects (those below \$500K) and those in the Maintenance Reserve category (approximately \$8 million/biennium).

University of Wisconsin: Planning and Landscape Architecture is responsible for working with faculty, staff, students and the surrounding urban community to implement the Campus Master Plan; assists with capital budgeting, site, infrastructure and physical planning/landscape processes; manages campus real estate transactions; assists with ADA accommodations, and is developing a campus electronic mapping system.

Describe the scope of responsibilities for the following departments, and include whether services are provided to general fund and auxiliary operations.

Construction:

UCB: The Design and Construction Division assists campus general fund and auxiliary clients through the various steps and processes necessary to bring a construction project to a successful completion. The services provided include the procurement of consultant services, project budget estimates, project activity coordination and on-site inspection services for small remodeling, renovation and modifications of existing buildings as well as new and complex campus facilities. The Facilities Design and Construction Division serves as the link between the campus and the Colorado State Buildings Program Division to ensure all state procurement laws and fiscal rules are followed on construction projects.

Arizona State University: We provide minor construction through our shops. Larger projects are bid out to local contractors and bill back all charges to the work order # and the respective funding source.

Colorado State University: This program involves services required to coordinate design, bidding, financial and scheduling controls, administration of contracts, and monitor project progress, through project closeout and warranty period. It also includes administering the consultant selection process and drafting and negotiating appropriate professional contracts required for the particular project. Construction Services provides administrative management and professional services required to facilitate and accomplish new construction, renovation and replacement of the physical facilities and infrastructure of Colorado State University. Services include assistance with review of design/scope of a project, administration and monitor of project budget and schedule to ensure meeting all

requirements and timelines, serving as liaison for client and University, along with adherence to all state building codes, policies and procedures. There are several ways projects can be funded: state funds (including capital construction or controlled maintenance), departmental funds, bonds. State funds support improvements at SDU such as replacing deteriorated mechanical systems, replacing alarm systems in buildings, replacing asphalt, construction of new buildings, various campus improvements, etc. Departmental funds can be used for remodeling of offices, replacing/removing walls, replacing fume hoods, etc.

Stanford: The Construction Management Office is responsible for the administration of the bidding and construction phases of major and minor building projects. This group monitors compliance of construction contractors and subcontractors with the University's External Affirmative Action Program. On-site inspection of most construction activity is performed by the Office of Construction Management.

University of Utah: Campus Design and Construction is a department of 29 employees. It consists of: 1 director, 5 team managers (one manager per geographic zone of the campus), 4 construction coordinators, 5 staff architects, 3 mechanical engineers, 2 electrical engineers, 1 computer technician, 1 computer professional, 1 architectural drafting technician, 2 hourly employees and 4 secretarial support staff. Together their role is to promote excellence in providing architectural, engineering, and construction services required to fulfill the University's strategic needs for high quality facilities which are functional, accessible, and within the parameters of the University's Long Range Development Plan. Campus Design and Construction is responsible for selecting and coordinating architects and engineers for the design and construction of new buildings and major remodels. The department works closely with Facilities planning and other Facilities Management departments in the design and construction of facilities projects.

University of Wisconsin: While we do planning for most projects, all design and construction is very much under the control of our State Department of Administration (DOA). We can design and construct projects under \$30,000 without DOA approval. DOA can and does delegate most projects to us under \$100,000, but all projects over that amount are designed by consultant A/E's selected by DOA and all construction supervision is done by DOA.

Describe the scope of responsibilities for the following departments, and include whether services are provided to both general and auxiliary funds.

Operations and Maintenance:

UCB: Operations and Maintenance maintains and operates building mechanical systems, structural/architectural components and grounds areas for all of the academic and research facilities on the Boulder campus. Ninety individuals perform general maintenance, electrical, plumbing, sheet metal, roofing, lock-smithing, carpentry, painting, machining, preventive maintenance, refrigeration, heating, ventilation and air-conditioning controls, elevator, masonry, grounds, landscaping, and snow removal tasks. A small construction team provides small renovation projects for campus departments. Asbestos abatement and maintenance service are available through this division.

Arizona State University: These are provided by our shops as well as building techs, and custodial services. These are provided to academic and general use as part of our mission and are available to auxiliaries for a charge back. Again, they can out-source if they can prove it is to their benefit.

Colorado State University: Services are general funded. We do have fee for service work on occasion for auxiliary services.

MIT: Operations and maintenance is included under Facilities Management, for general fund activities.

Stanford: Operations & Maintenance is responsible for ongoing maintenance, repair, and operation of the University's physical plant. Operations and Maintenance also functions as the construction contractor on some remodeling projects managed by FPM.

University of Utah: Plant Operations is a department of 642 employees; 28 exempt/management, 614 non-exempt, including hourly employees. Plant Operations' mission is to sustain the integrity and appearance of the campus environment while supporting the pursuit of the educational process, research activities, and public involvement, by effectively utilizing human, financial, and physical resources.

University of Virginia: The Facilities Operations department falls under Facilities Management and is composed of traditional physical plant shops to handle normal building maintenance, custodial, landscaping services, preparations for events and renovations. We also have a Medical Center Physical Plant which is similar to Facilities Operations but serves the Medical Center.

University of Washington: Facilities Services is responsible for the maintenance and operation of existing facilities and assists in making sure new facilities can be maintained and operated in a reasonable manner. Engineering Services is the primary contact with the design team and is assisted by staff from Physical Plant, Custodial Services, and Transportation Services as appropriate.

University of Wisconsin: The Physical Plant is responsible for maintenance and upkeep of buildings, vehicles, grounds and campus utilities. Design resources, construction trades and specialized facilities services are available for departmental requests and remodeling projects on a not-for-profit chargeback basis.

Indicate the amount, in square feet, managed by your Facilities Planning department.

UCB: A total of 9.2 million gross square feet. The facilities planning department does not manage this existing square footage. Space management is done in the Office of Planning, Budget and Analysis.

Arizona State University: A little over 8 million GSF.

Colorado State University: Total gross square footage is 8,071,522; with 5,314,162 in residential instruction; 2,462,342 in Auxiliary; and 295,018 is for leased space. Total land acreage is given at 95,064 acres.

MIT: 9.7 million square feet.

Stanford: Over 700 million square feet

University of Denver: 2.7 million gross square feet.

University of Utah: 8,811,677 gross square feet.

University of Virginia: 11,461,667 gsf and 2,459 acres of land.

University of Washington: 14,782,000 gsf

University of Wisconsin: Area (acres) main campus: 933 Arboretum: 1,262 Experimental Research stations: 6,100 Off-campus properties: 2,354

What is your institution's annual construction budget?

UCB: There is no annual construction budget. Construction varies significantly year-to-year. As of June, 1998, there were 38 construction projects over \$250,000 in progress with a total value of \$88.2 million, 47 smaller construction projects valued at \$4.7 million, and 59 controlled/deferred maintenance projects at \$15.2 million, for a total of 144 projects valued at \$108.2 million.

Arizona State University: It varies. We currently have approximately \$100 million annual bonding capacity. We get Building Renewal funding from the State. This has been running approximately \$10 million for the last couple of years but may be substantially less this year.

MIT: Our annual construction budget is set both long-range as well as current year priorities. We are entering a period of large capital construction to extend over the next 5 to 7 years. This increase in capital construction, as well as work in building renewal, will increase our construction budget over this time period.

University of Denver: Over \$9 million annual operating and plant fund budget.

University of New Mexico: Physical Plant: \$79.3 million in expenditures.

University of Utah: Last year the university's construction expenditures were \$80.4 million. We do not have an annual construction budget. Physical facility funding available can vary substantially from year to year depending on state legislative approvals (very limited), donor funds, and other non-state and self-funded project sources. The University's general fund provides \$1.5-\$1.8 million annually for various minor remodeling projects.

University of Virginia: Fiscal year 1999 (CY98/99) construction work in place totals \$46.1 million. In addition, 71 construction contracts with a value of \$70 million, and 180 professional services contracts with a value of \$12.5 million, were awarded. FY 1998 revenues were \$129 million State (20 percent), \$222.5 million (of which \$130 million was research-related) in gifts, grants, research contracts (34 percent), \$154 million from student fees and tuition (24 percent), \$90 million auxiliary enterprises (14 percent), and \$34 million endowment (5 percent).

University of Wisconsin: We have approximately \$1 million budgeted annually for planning. Of that, about \$300,000 is for long range planning, \$200,000 for capital budget planning, and \$500,000 for major project planning. In addition, our operating budget includes another \$20 million for repairs, maintenance and minor remodeling.

How many construction projects does your Facilities Planning Office handle each year?

UCB: Complete counts are not available. In addition to capital projects counts, there are many small building projects to review, and very many small projects to handle.

Arizona State University: Approximately 3-5 major (Capital) projects and approximately 200+ smaller projects.

Colorado State University: The total projects for fiscal year 1999 totaled 293. Average number over a 4-year period was 330.

MIT: The Department of Facilities has approximately 120 construction projects per year.

University of Arizona: Currently managing about 70 projects from \$25,000 to new \$60 million structures.

University of Denver: Over 100 construction projects managed annually.

University of Utah: Facilities Planning and Campus Design & Construction combined handle approximately 400 projects annually.

University of Virginia: 200 requests annually for project support (planning, design and construction for capital and non-capital projects). In addition, they generally see approximately 30 major capital projects over a 6-year period.

University of Wisconsin: Our planning organization handles approximately 100 projects per year over \$100,000, and the physical plant another 200-500 under \$100,000.

What are your total annual research and sponsored program revenues?

UCB: \$204 million in 1999

Arizona State University: We show \$10-14 million in gifts and "other" as funding sources on our current CIP.

MIT: The Department of Facilities is unable to share this information.

University of Virginia: \$222.5 million (of which \$130 million was research-related) in gifts, grants, research contracts (34 percent of FY98 revenues).

University of Washington: \$475 million.

University of Wisconsin: Funding for research and development is \$458 million.

What funding is allocated to the planning function at your campus?

UCB: \$228,000 was in the 99-00 budget. Once every ten years or so, additional funds are allocated for a master plan.

Arizona State University: Not much. We just recently started a specific "Planning" area within Facilities Planning and Construction, under Facilities Management. This area will probably cost about \$200,000 annually (including salaries) to maintain.

Colorado State University: For the program activities listed under "planning" in the enclosure provided for question #2. The FY99/00 budget is \$675,127 (including fringe benefits).

MIT: Funding is provided from general funds.

University of Utah: Funding from the university's general fund (state sources) supports the Facilities Planning department annual budget for staff and non-personal expenses. Services to University campus colleges and departments is provided by Facilities Planning at no cost. Additional funds are requested through University administration for specific planning projects (e.g. the LRDP).

University of Virginia: FY 1998 revenues were \$129 million State (20 percent), \$222.5 million (of which \$130 million was research-related) in gifts, grants, research contracts (34 percent), \$154 million from student fees and tuition (24 percent), \$90 million auxiliary enterprises (14 percent), and \$34 million endowment (5 percent).

University of Wisconsin: Over the last three biennia, the University has witnessed an increased need to develop and rely on non-state sources of funding for its major capital projects. Funding from private sources, in the form of gifts and grants, federal grant programs and revenues generated from auxiliary program activities have replaced, to a greater and greater extent, the State's Capital Program Budget as the University's primary funding source. In the 1991-93 biennium, the University, in partnership with the State, successfully developed a matching capital project fund program, the Wisconsin Initiative for State Technology & Applied Research (WISTAR), and has aggressively sought private gifts and grants from federal agencies, private foundations and others. The State's 1997-99 Capital Budget included another University/State partnership, the \$210 million HealthStar Program, to construct new health science facilities.

This trend is expected to continue as the State Legislature and the Governor respond to increased pressures for property tax relief, funding assistance to the State's elementary and secondary school districts and other issues. The debt service necessary to finance state under construction projects competes directly with these other needs.

For the 1999-2001 biennia the State eliminated its "Maximum Request Guideline", which had placed a ceiling of requests for major, enumerated projects for several biennia. Yet the importance of program funding, donor support, or other funding streams, in whole or in part, cannot be overlooked. Projects with at least partial outside funding have a better chance of being approved than those lacking any private support.

What resources are provided to your planning staff? For example, what advanced technological tools are available, such as CAD, and how many square feet of space are available per FTE?

UCB: CAD is available through another division of Facilities Management. A computer network serves each planning employee, and a variety of typical office software is available. Office per FTE is about 130 square feet.

Arizona State University: We have CAD (Autocad R14) with 3D modeling, advanced website interface. We also recently got a GIS system to verify our site plan/base maps. We are awaiting funding for an infrastructure modeling/planning software to evaluate utilities needs/availability.

Colorado State University: Resources available to the planning staff are as follows: Microsoft office products, AutoCAD, a LankdCad ESRI Arcview/arCInfo, Centralized space databases, one-line building floor plans, access to all building as-builts, external printing services for large projects, small budget for hiring outside consultants as needed, most professional offices are 108 asf, access to drawing tables, photo libraries.

MIT: In Facilities, we utilize CAD, the Incite Space Accounting System, Maximo System, SAP (financial System) as well as several desktop I/T technology bases programs. In addition, our Central Utilities Plant (CUP) and our Operational units utilize technology systems specific to this area.

University of Utah: Software available includes but is not limited to MicroStation, AutoCAD, Adobe PhotoShop and Illustrator. A digital camera, HP platter and Power Point equipment is available to, and shared by, the Facilities Management organization. Office sizes: Director's office: 143 square feet. Staff Architect and Administrative Assistant shared office: 169 square feet.

University of Virginia: GIS, CAD, and the latest associated reproduction and digitizing hardware. Around 100SF net per person.

University of Wisconsin: We have CAD and a variety of graphic and mapping software tools. Average office is 120-140 asf.

How many requests for renovation/built facilities were initiated over the last five years?

UCB: not available

Arizona State University: Approximately 100-150 per year.

Colorado State University: *relevant chart is in CSU packet, however, there doesn't seem to be any differentiation between initiated projects, and carry overs.*

MIT: 930 renovations/built projects were initiated over the last 5 years.

University of Utah: Approximately 1,700.

University of Wisconsin: Approximately 100 requests for major renovations or new facilities over the past five years.

What is the typical number of projects—planning, construction, or renovation— that your facilities planning staff manages annually?

UCB: This varies. Currently (March, 2000), the number of projects being handled by the Facilities Planning office are: 17 conceptual planning phase projects, 8 program planning phase projects (\$185.1 million), 1 architect section phase project (\$51 million), 8 design phase projects (\$62.5 million), and 10 construction phase projects (\$43.9 million).

Arizona State University: Our Project Managers handle approximately 2 to 4 Capital “active” projects at a time (sometimes overlap into 8-10 in different stages of finished). The Design Coordinators handle the smaller renovation work and carry an average of 5-10 active projects at one time.

Colorado State University: Average over 4-year period: 330. Last year: 293.

MIT: As noted in question 9, Facilities has been involved in approximately 930 projects over the last 5 years. Facilities has responsibility for the management of each of these projects.

University of Arizona: Currently over 70 projects working.

University of Utah: Combined, Facilities Planning and Campus Design and Construction have about 44 per year.

University of Virginia: 200+ requests for service project support annually in addition to approx. 30 major capital projects over a 6-year period.

University of Washington: Renovations annually: range of 74,000-80,000 (renovation project < 25,000 labor costs).

University of Wisconsin: Our planning organization handles approximately 100 projects per year over \$100,000, and the physical plant another 200-250 under \$100,000.

Describe your campus’ capital planning process. What review procedures (i.e., committees, design review board) does your campus require for expediting projects for submission to your legislature?

UCB:

- Following initiation of a project by an interested department, the Planning Office writes a conceptual plan, with authorizations by campus administrators and reviews by the Boulder Campus Planning Commission (BCPC) and the Campus Executive Committee (CEC).
- The Planning Office then writes a program plan, with authorizations by campus administrators, reviews by the BCPC, CEC, and approvals by the Board of Regents and the CCHE.
- The Planning Office then drafts the capital budget requests, with reviews by campus administrators, BCPC, CEC, the Board of Regents, and approvals by several State agency committees prior to State Legislative action.
- If funded, the Planning Office oversees selection of an architect, with approval by the Board of Regents.
- Project design is reviewed by a list of possible campus stakeholders, BCPC, and the University Design Review Board.

Arizona State University: We don’t submit to our legislature, only to Board of Regents. We use outside A/Es on all CIP projects and Const. Mgrs. on anything over about \$5 Mil. A VP level initiates a project request, sets up a User Committee to develop scope and budget, we then submit to Board for “project initiation” if approved we then hire A/E to do early programming and develop schematic estimate, goes to Board for “conceptual approval”. User group then selects A/E for design work. Public Arts and Design Review Council (PADRC) has say over selection process for A/E. We then go back through our PADRC and of the Board for scope and budget review at the following stages: project approval, project construction and project closeout.

Colorado State University:

- Capital projects - estimated cost over \$100,000-Capital projects are prioritized by each College/Agency and generally move up the PDP priority list over time. Capital projects that are partially funded or under construction must be included and should be at the top of the priority list. Capital Projects are reviewed by the Physical Development Committee as described in Step 2.
- Assemble Draft Physical Development Plan-Facilities Management and the Physical Development Committee (PDC) develop a prioritized project list based on the previous fiscal year capital construction plan and additional information obtained through Step 1. The PDC membership consists of a representative from each Vice President’s office, every College, at the Faculty Council, Classified Personnel Council, Associated Students of Colorado State University, Legal Counsel, Resources for Disabled Students, City of Fort Collins, and other

Division of Administrative Services staff. The PDC establishes a subcommittee to review each facilities project within the plan and drafts a new PDP priority list. These priorities are then reviewed by the entire PDC, and by the campus community through the strategic plan review process, then approved by the Executive Budget Committee (EBC) as a recommendation to the President.

- Approval of the University's Physical Development Plan-Final Executive Budget Committee (EBC) recommendations on the Draft PDP are forwarded to Colorado State University President and Cabinet for approval. The PDP is then presented to the State Board of Agriculture (SBA) for final SBA-approval in May.
- Develop Capital Construction Budget Request (CCBR)-The Vice President for Administrative Services and Facilities Management develop a funding plan for the State Board of Agriculture-approved PDP obtained in Step 3 above. The funding plan reflects a realistic assessment of potential funding sources including legislative capital construction appropriations, operating funds, the research building revolving fund, user fees, development funds, and grants. The potential for utilization of debt financing is also part of this analysis. The CCBR is then prepared according to guidelines established by the CCHE and the State Buildings Programs.
- Submission to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)-The Capital Construction Budget Request is then submitted to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE). By statute it is duty of the CCHE to annually petition each state institution of higher education to prepare and submit a Capital Construction Budget Request (CCBR). The CCHE review phase determines the relative urgency and impact of state investments with respect to statewide higher education system priorities. CCHE establishes a recommended priority of state funding for the next year and together with a unified five-year plan, recommendations are transmitted to the Office of State Planning and Budgeting (OSPB), the Governor, and the General Assembly for Long Bill consideration [23-1-106(7)(a),C.R.S.]. The CCBR generally includes the highest priority CSU capital construction fund (CCF) projects within the Physical Development Plan along with those cash projects greater than \$500,000 for which legislative spending authority is required.

MIT: MIT has a space planning process that has responsibility for review of space requests. The MIT CRSP, (Committee for the Review of Space Planning) has the authority to review and approve/disapprove all space changes and assignments within the academic real estate portfolio. CRSP is chaired by the Chancellor, vice-chaired by the Executive Vice-President and is supported by the Secretary is also the Institute's Space Administrator.

Stanford: Major projects: Major projects are new buildings and large scale renovation work which will cost more than \$750,000. Departments and schools involved in major building projects work closely with the Provost's Office, FPM, and the Planning Office during the complex planning and construction process. All major projects must be approved by the Board of Trustees as to academic program need, physical design, and funding. The University Committee on Land and Building Development is also involved in design reviews. *The numerous steps involved in planning a major project are too extensive to specify in this Guide Memo, but detailed information is available from FPM.*

University of Arizona: partial - Projects over \$1 Million: These projects are included in the University's annual Capital Improvement Plan for Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) approval. Project phases are as follows:

- ABOR Project Initiation Approval
- Architect/Engineer Selection
- Conceptual Design
- ABOR Conceptual Approval
- Design and Construction Drawings
- ABOR Project Approval
- Bidding and Award
- Construction
- Occupancy

University of Utah: Requests for both state funded and non-state funded projects originate with the individual college or department. Facilities Planning generates background pre-program information including project justification, description, space list and "order of magnitude" cost estimate. Site analyses and recommendations are developed. The pre-program information and project requests are reviewed/approved by the Vice President of the respective college, the Senior Vice President and the University President. Upon approval, the request advances to the University Board of Trustees, State Board of Regents, the Utah State Building Board and finally to the Legislature. State funded Regents and State Building Board levels. Approval from each of these groups is required before a request can move forward. Upon completion of the approval process, the Campus Planning Advisory Committee (CPAC), consisting of representatives from campus staff an faculty, review and offer suggestions

throughout the siting, programming and design phases. The on and off-campus community is also provided with opportunities for input through the monthly open forum meetings conducted by Facilities Planning.

University of Virginia: The Capital Project Program process applies to all Capital Projects over \$500,000. It is basically an update of the previous year's 6-year plan and is a biennial submission (every two years). The update captures prior funding realities and any new initiatives. Much of the University's Capital Program is made up of non-state funds but the University still must convince the Governor to submit the budget, and still requires legislative authority (but not funding) to execute the non-state (non-general) fund projects. This is the process to secure state (general) funds as well. The availability of gifts and grants can be very time sensitive. The investment of auxiliary revenues in capital is also time sensitive but from a revenue-generating perspective. These two fund sources have self-generating justification while the general-funded projects require ample justification.

University of Wisconsin: The UW-Madison physical planning process is structured to coincide with the State of Wisconsin's biennial budget cycle. The process includes developing a 6-year facilities plan and preparing a prioritized list of proposed capital projects for inclusion in the State's next Capital Building Program. Issue Statements prepared by schools, colleges, and divisions, enable the CPC to make informed decisions on physical planning issues brought forward by schools, colleges, or divisions. Issue Statements are required for each major project (\$500,000 or greater) submitted by a college, school, or division, for inclusion in the physical planning cycle, and regardless of the biennium within the 6-year planning cycle the project is placed.

Following review of all Issue Statements in May 1999, the CPC selects the issues which warrant immediate attention. These issues then receive further development through preparation of Project Request Documents (PRDs), which build upon the Issue Statement as a physical planning issue becomes more defined and closer to inclusion in the State's Capital Building Program. Concurrent with the Major Projects process, FP&M develops a 6-year list of campus minor projects (\$100,00-\$500,000) and infrastructure (repair and replacement) projects (\$100,000 or greater). Like major projects, these projects are submitted in two sections: a prioritized project list for the upcoming biennium and a section identifying future physical planning projects for the two subsequent biennia.

Major Projects (\$500,000 or greater)- This section identifies the seven phases of the physical planning process for major projects involving new construction or renovations. The activities and outcomes critical to each phase are briefly described. There may be overlap between activities in some time periods because documentation of issues, or projects, may progress at different rates in different schools, colleges, or divisions, due to the nature of the issue or project.

In its initial stages, the physical planning process involves participation by a broad cross-section of the campus. As each phase is concluded, the breath of participation narrows as the process of developing the University's physical planning issues becomes more focused and specific.

- **Assessment Phase—Winter 1999:** The process begins with school, college, and major administrative division meetings to assess the adequacy of current facilities and determine what building improvements would enhance its ability to fulfill its mission, address strategic plans, and/or meet anticipated changes in program scope, service delivery, and/or technology. It is vitally important for each school, college, and division, to conduct its review within the context of its academic strategic plan. Those issues that are driven and directed by this focus will have the most strategic importance at the campus level. During this phase, FP&M staff meet with representatives of the schools, colleges and divisions to discuss the physical planning process. The meetings enable FP&M staff to familiarize themselves with the University's near and long term academic, research and support program goals.
- **Identification and Definition Phase—Winter/Spring 1999:** The second phase involves identifying and defining the problems or planning issues pertinent to each program area. As problem and planning issues are defined, schools and colleges are encouraged to work closely with FP&M staff to prepare Issue Statements for CPC consideration.

Following development of its issues, each school, college, and division is expected to place the issues in relative importance to one another and present them in three groups. These groupings enable the school, college or division to communicate a level of relative priority and timing. The groupings should reflect the practical reality that state resources are limited and all projects cannot be supported at the same time.

Table 1 illustrates how the groupings might relate to the three biennia, and offers summary explanations for placing given issues in a particular level:

Level	Biennium	Rationale(s)
One	First	Serious problem and critical need in building system, health and safety issues, space deficiency, program impaired, building code deficiencies or requirements, accreditation requirements, timing with other projects may be critical, external funding (non-GPR) may be available.
Two	Second	Not as critical as Level One, but serious deficiencies were identified. The issue(s) should receive attention relatively early in six-year capital budget planning cycle. Issue(s) lack sufficient definition or external funding.
Three	Third	Least critical level, but serious problems were identified in an existing facility, which should receive attention before the end of the six-year planning cycle. Other facility issues need to be addressed first, external funding is needed, program is hampered but not impaired, more study is warranted.

These self-assessments will enable the CPC to make informed decisions when it meets in May 1999 to interleave all campus issue statements and determine which to select for further study. Since CPC decisions must reflect campus-wide priorities, CPC groupings may or may not confirm a school, college or division's recommendation.

- Selection Phase—Spring 1999-This phase determines the relative importance of resolving specific issues to the University as a whole. At its May meeting, the CPC groups the planning issues. It then determines which ones will have the greatest positive effect on the campus and best promote fulfillment of the University's mission. Issues selected by the CPC for Level One ranking move on as potential projects for the first biennium of the six-year planning cycle. Documentation and analysis of these issues continues through development of project request documents. The remaining issues are developed to a lesser extent for potential placement in subsequent biennia of the six-year planning cycle. Ultimately, the final prioritized list may be adjusted to reflect the nature of the projects, their cost, new developments, opportunities or special circumstances and/or construction timing.
- Analysis Phase—late Spring/Summer 1999-The prioritized issues receive in-depth analysis, including further definition of project scope, justification, advancement of alternative solutions, development of preliminary (construction and operating) budgets, and assembling additional materials and information as needed. This information is developed into draft Project Request Documents (PRDs).
- Evaluation Phase—Solution Presentations (Fall 1999)-Presentations based on the draft PRDs are presented to the CPC during this phase, including discussion of the advantages, disadvantages, and costs of each alternative. FP&M staff continue to work closely with campus units and provide procedural guidance and technical support as needed. Following each presentation, the CPC may request revision and/or expansion of the draft PRDs.
- Prioritization Phase (late Fall 1999)-In December, the CPC begins its deliberations to establish the University's six-year capital building program. IT prioritizes the project requests into three tiers: projects proposed for 2001-2003, 2003-05, and 2005-07. Following this ranking process, the program is sent to the Chancellor for approval and is then forwarded to UW System in January 2000.
- Documentation Phase (Winter/Spring 2000)- FP&M staff, in conjunction with faculty/users, finalize PRDs and respond to project documentation requests from UWSA. Each PRD may be expanded and/or refined as needed during this period. The PRD is the key document for justifying building projects to the Regents and SBC and becomes the basic guide for the architectural/engineering firm contracted to design the facility. UW-Madison's 2001-2007 Capital Building Program, a compendium of the finalized PRDs, issue statements and prioritized infrastructure projects, is published during the spring semester. Also during this period, UWSA develops a proposed system-wide priority list and alerts campuses in January which projects it will support for enumeration in the next biennium.

Capital Planning Process: Minor Projects (\$100,000-\$500,00).

And Infrastructure Projects (\$100,000 or greater) -A second 10-month effort runs concurrently with the Major Project development process to identify and document minor projects (new construction or remodeling projects between \$100,00-500) and Infrastructure-repair and replacement projects (\$100,000 or greater) for the campus. FP&M staff are primarily responsible for this process.

1. Identification Phase (spring 1999)-Early in this phase, the list of proposed minor projects and potential infrastructure repair/replacement projects from prior years is reviewed and updated. An inventory of facility problems identified during the current biennia are added to the historical list and categorized.

2. Analysis Phase (summer-fall 1999)-All identified issues are documented for project scope, justifications and estimated budgets during this period.
3. Prioritization Phase (winter 2000)-FP&M senior staff review the list of projects in each category, prioritizing them by need for one of the three biennia and ranking those projects in the first biennia within each category. The CPC approves the proposed Capital Building Program-Infrastructure Projects before forwarding them to UWSA in January.

UW REVIEW PROCESS

- Selection Phase (early winter 2000)-Following receipt of capital building programs from each UW campus in January, 2000, UWSA reviews the proposed projects and advises which major project proposals warrant consideration and should be further developed for possible inclusion in the Capital Budget, and directs Program Statement development by the institutions.
- Review and Prioritization Phase (winter-spring 2000)-Following its selection process, UWSA staff review the viable projects (PRDs) for content and completeness. The infrastructure and minor project proposal lists are added to the major project list when they are received from the campuses. Once documentation is finalized, the selected projects are published as the proposed UW System Capital Building Program.
- Briefing Period (summer 2000)-Following publication of the proposed System Capital Building Program, the Assistant Vice President personally briefs the Regents for Capital Planning & Budget prior to the Regents' August meeting to consider the Capital Budget.
- Approval (August 2000)-The Regents approve the official UW System Capital Building Program and submit it to the State for consideration.

State Review Process

The UW System Capital Building Program, as approved by the Regents, is forwarded to the State in late summer, 2000. The SBC and Joint Finance Committee review the campus' project proposals amongst proposals from other state agencies as part of their biennial budget deliberations. The State Legislature's biennial budget process typically lasts into July, of odd-numbered years, before being passed by both houses and sent to the governor for signature.

- Selection, Review and Prioritization Phase (fall 2000)-Following receipt of capital building programs from each state agency in September, 2000, DFD reviews the projects for viability, makes a recommendation for each project to "approve, defer, or deny" and provides a brief analysis for each recommendation.
- Briefing Period (winter 2001)- DFD publishes its proposed State Capital Building Program and distributes it to the SBC's Higher Education Subcommittee in February for study prior to formal consideration by the SBC in March.
- SBC Recommendation Phase (early spring 2001)-The SBC considers the DGD Capital Building Program recommendations in March 2001 and sends the approved program to the State Legislature's Joint Committee on Finance for consideration.
- Legislative Review Phase (spring 2001)- The Joint Committee on Finance reviews the proposed State Capital Building Program as part of its biennial budget deliberations, recommending the Program for enactment by the full legislature. The State Legislature prepares the biennial budget and sends it to the Governor for signature.
- Approval Phase (summer 2001)-The Governor approves the biennial budget bill by signing it into law.

Implementation Process

Once a biennial budget becomes law, planning, design, bidding and construction of projects may proceed under the authority of the SBC and the direction of the DFD.

Documentation Process

Issue Statement (deadline April 1, 1999)-The Issue Statement is each school, college or major division's opportunity to begin documenting their physical planning needs, and documenting their physical planning needs, and communicating those needs to FP&M staff and the CPC. Issue Statements are required for each major project submitted for inclusion in the 2001-2007 physical planning cycle, regardless of biennium.

What is the organizational structure of your institution's facilities planning office? Please identify strengths and weaknesses.

UCB: The Facilities Planning Office is in the department of Facilities Management, which in turn reports to the Vice Chancellor for Administration. The Facilities Planning Office consists of a director, campus planner, facilities planner, and administrative assistant. A Campus Architect has been in the office but may soon be a separate report. Many offices at the university request work from the Planning Office. Planning activities are also spread out to several offices. Coordination issues have increased.

Arizona State University: The Associate Director of Facilities Management reports directly to Director of FM. Reporting to the Associate Director, is an Assistant Director for Planning (new position with processes to be developed), an Assistant Director for Design Management and Construction Admin. (does all CIP/large work), and a Campus Architect (does standards and smaller construction projects). This is a new organizational structure to address our previous lack of planning/master planning/strategic planning.

Colorado State University: Over the past 10 years, the planning function has been in four separate organizations: a 1-man office under the Vice President; a 4-person department for planning; a combined Facilities Development department (including design and construction); and as it is today, one section of the overall Facilities Management department. The current organizational structure of Planning/Property Management and Data & Information Systems consists of 16 employees: a manager who oversees the subunits of Data & Information Systems, Planning, and Property Management; five (5) employees in Data & Information Systems; four (4) employees in Planning; three (3) employees in Property Management. Planning section employees are a General Professional III, a Landscape Architect II, an Architect I, and a General Professional II. **Strengths:** Responsive to request for special projects and changes in scope; professional approach to clients, issues and final product; attention to detail; knowledge of CSU and CCHE systems and procedures, and planning processes; internal communications (excellent); incorporating all interested parties in planning processes, including Fac Maint, ACNS, and other affected departments. **Weaknesses:** Writing styles could be more concise and consistent; clarity of and adherence to long range goals needs improvement – lack of this leads to occasional need to begin planning projects before University direction is finalized, i.e., false starts, can cause dissatisfaction on the part of client departments; attention to detail (some inconsistency); occasionally need support from management when directing a planning committee toward University goals; archiving/utilizing existing facilities data via effective use of information systems needs improvement; coordination with Fac Construction (is improving); difficulty saying “no” when existing workload requires full attention.

University of Utah: The Facilities Planning department consists of three FTEs: the Director, Staff Architect and an Administrative Assistant. We work very closely with all departments in Facilities Management. Weekly project review meetings and plan reviews provide opportunities for representatives from the Facilities Management organization as well as other facilities related groups on campus to participate and direct planning and design resulting in complete and thorough reviews, accurate construction drawings and effective design. Communication and open participation are key elements in the success of the operations of Facilities Planning and the facility projects coordinated by the Facilities Management group. There are always challenges of a limited number of staff and limited funding. Positive relationships within the organization and a true sense of teamwork are based upon mutual respect and the desire to maintain the beauty and integrity of the University campus.

University of Virginia: The Director of Facilities Planning & Construction reports to the Chief Facilities Officer, who reports to the Vice President for Management and Budget, who reports to the “Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer”, who reports to the President. In addition, the Board of Visitors serves as the corporate board for the University’s policies, finances and long-term planning. Thirty-two FTE project and construction managers. Check websites: <http://fac.mgmt.virginia.edu/fpc/links.htm> and <http://uarch.virginia.edu/> and <http://www.virginia.edu/>

University of Wisconsin: Materials sent show the three planning units which report directly to the Assistant Vice Chancellor for FP&M. The major strength is that all capital planning is done under one organization. A weakness is that the Assistant Vice Chancellor doesn’t have adequate time to coordinate the three units. Also, small (under \$100,000) project planning is done in the Physical Plant which separates the two in-house A/E staffs into two organizational units and two physical locations. This also requires further coordination time by the AVC.

What professional expertise or experience do you require when hiring capital planning staff?

UCB: In general, facilities planning experience is required. Each job has different requirements based on the State Classification System.

Arizona State University: Project Management experience, ability to work and communicate well with others and ability to handle multiple task (jobs) at one time.

Colorado State University: Architect I: Bachelor's degree or higher in Architecture, Architectural Engineering or closely related field AND license to practice as an Architect in the State of Colorado. *Highly Desirable:* programmatic planning for buildings; and planning of facilities, preferably in a university campus or related environment. Valid Colorado driver's license.

Campus Planner: Two years professional facilities planning experience, preferably in a university campus environment, minimally in an urban setting, AND BS in Planning, Architecture, Landscape Architecture or closely related field. *Substitution:* High level technical planning experience can be substituted for the BS degree on a four-year basis. There is no substitution for two years professional planning experience required. *Highly Desirable:* Experience in long range facilities planning for transportation, utilities, building renovations and new construction. Excellent communication skills, both verbal and written. Planning Intern: Bachelor's degree. *Substitution:* High level clerical/technical work experience as or at the level of an Admin Assistant 3/Accounting Tech 3 which provided the same kind, amount, and level of knowledge acquired in a college level degree may be substituted on a year for year basis. *Highly Desirable:* Knowledge of Quattro Pro, Word Perfect and database experience; familiarity with Colorado State University physical campus. Position will require a pre-employment security clearance.

Stanford: Facilities Engineer/Coordinator 3: Facilities Engineers at this level apply knowledge of a specialized field of engineering, a good background in related fields, and extensive design or evaluation experience on engineering projects so that considerable judgment can be brought to bear on unusually difficult matters related to engineering design and financial requirements dependent on engineering design considerations. These incumbents are expected to apply new and innovative approaches and methods to complete major phases of a project independently. Facilities Coordinator positions at this level are expected to have significant and critical long-range policy/financial impact with incumbents operating with substantial independence. Positions frequently involve coordination of extremely complex activities in a highly sensitive environment also characterized by divergent interests and intense pressures. Qualifications: This classification level normally requires graduation from college with a BS degree in engineering and approximately five years experience in maintenance, construction, or engineering fields, or an equivalent combination of education and experience. Most Facilities Coordinator positions at this level also require at least two years of prior supervisory experience. For positions with supervisory responsibility, this classification requires that the employee know and supply sound supervisory practices and effectively implement the University's Affirmative Action Program.

University of Utah: Architectural background, public relations, excellent communication skills, desire to maintain and enhance the University campus, and a high work ethic standard.

University of Virginia: Our project and construction managers generally are degreed and registered architects or engineers with a minimum of five years of experience.

University of Wisconsin: We seek physical campus planning skills (e.g. landscape architecture or urban planning) for the long range planning staff, budget analyst skills for the capital budget staff, and A/E skills for the major project staff.

Describe the extent to which outsourcing options are utilized by your institution for facilities planning and construction.

UCB: Outsourcing is used extensively. Consultants often write program plans and other studies. Consultants do all design, except for some conceptual sketching. The planner's role is often one of coordinating work between one or several consultants and the university departments involved. In some cases, it has proved less expensive to write certain documents in-house if there is available staff time.

Arizona State University: We outsource all design work for projects over \$25,000 in construction costs and most CM on large projects. This is very different from where I previously worked (University of Texas) where we did all design work under \$600,000 in-house.

Colorado State University: We routinely hire architects/engineers to assist with program planning. In-house professionals complete some program plans with code review elements outsourced. Third party review is completed

by a consultant hired by the State Board of Agriculture. Occasionally project management is outsourced. Design is outsourced for larger projects and occasionally for smaller projects.

MIT: Recently, Facilities participated in the Northwestern University outsourcing survey. Please let me know if you would like a copy of this survey.

University of Utah: Architects and engineers are hired as consultants through established state procurement procedures. Facilities Management staff act as project managers and coordinators. Programming and design services are outsourced; construction is awarded through low-bid or performance-based selection as required and conducted by the state DFCM.

University of Virginia: With few exceptions in small non-capital projects, all design is contracted and all construction is contracted, and managed by project managers and construction managers. All capital projects' design and construction is contracted and managed by project and construction managers. Many capital projects require a project investigation report (pir) which is used in programming and budget support. Most pirs are also contracted out.

University of Wisconsin: All major programming, design and construction is outsourced. We also hired consultants to help us complete our campus master plan.

How does your state appropriate funds for facilities?

UCB: For all major capital projects, the state legislature authorizes all expenditures and appropriates state funds. Funding is often in three stages: year one: design, year two: construction, year three: equipment.

Arizona State University: We ask for Building Renewal funds and the legislature appropriates funds as they choose. In the previous two years they had appropriated approx. 100 percent of our request; for this year and next they appropriated approximately 25 percent of what we asked for.

MIT: MIT is a private institution.

University of Utah: The state appropriated funds for facilities based on the qualifications and prioritization scoring and ranking process through the State Board of Regents and the State Building Board.

University of Wisconsin: Both the operating and capital budgets are done biennially. Tax support varies but is less than 30 percent for both operating and capital budgets. All major projects in excess of \$500,000 must be enumerated individually in the biennial budget regardless of funding source. All projects over \$100,000 must be individually approved by the State Building Commission for implementation. The eight member State Building Commission is a unique body, chaired by the Governor. It is staffed by the Department of Administration.

Fiscal Realities-Over the last three biennia, the University has witnessed an increased need to develop and rely on non-state sources of funding for its major capital projects. Funding from private sources, in the form of gifts and grants, federal grant programs and revenues generated from auxiliary program activities have replaced, to a greater and greater extent, the State's Capital Program Budget as the University's primary funding source.

In the 1991-93 biennium, the University, in partnership with the State, successfully developed a matching capital project fund program, the Wisconsin Initiative for State Technology & Applied Research (WISTAR), and has aggressively sought private gifts and grants from federal agencies, private foundations and others.

The State's 1997-99 Capital Budget included another University/State partnership, the \$210 million HealthStar Program, to construct new health science facilities. This trend is expected to continue as the State Legislature and the Governor respond to increased pressures for property tax relief, funding assistance to the State's elementary and secondary school districts and other issues. The debt service necessary to finance state-funded construction projects competes directly with these other needs. For the 1999-2001 biennia the State eliminated its "Maximum Request Guideline," which had placed a ceiling on requests for major, enumerated projects for several biennia. Despite this change, all state agencies, including UW System, were to "exercise restraint in preparing requests," due to the state's long term policy to limit debt service on state construction projects to "no more than four percent of the

statewide general purpose revenue (GPR) budget” and “substantial commitments...to fund major projects in the 1999-2001 biennium. Notwithstanding, UW-Madison projects have always had to compete with projects from campuses throughout the UW System, and UW System priorities have always been meshed with capital projects from other State agencies. The success rate for moving any proposed capital project forward is dependent upon the number and quality of arguments that can be developed in its support. Yet the importance of program funding, donor support, or other funding streams, in whole or in part, cannot be overlooked. Projects with at least partial outside funding have a better chance of being approved than those lacking any private support.

As in the 1999-01 capital budget process, the Regents are expected to endorse projects which support the academic goals and objectives of a campus, as identified through various strategic planning efforts, lateral reviews, quality reinvestments, enrollment projections, and accountability measures. Specifically, Regent criteria includes such factors as existing conditions, student benefit, academic significance of program served, operating efficiencies, improved space utilization, and use of contemporary instructional technology. The ranking methodology the Regents will use for determining the 2001-07 Capital Building Program will be established prior to the CPC's consideration of the campus' PRDs in the Fall, 1999, and will be used by the CPC during its selection and ranking deliberations. UW System staff also use the Regents' criteria when ranking all proposed state-funded Capital Building Projects for Regent review and approval.

State Building Commission/Division of Facilities Development Criteria-The SBC recommends the proposed State Building Program to the State Legislature for adoption. The DFD, as staff to the SBC, directs the development of the state's building program. DFD may recommend that a capital project proposal be approved, deferred, or denied, regardless of funding source.

Over the last three capital budget processes, the State has placed a strong emphasis on long-range facilities planning and effective management of existing space. As in past biennia, priority during the 1999-2001 biennia was given to:

- maximizing the use of existing facilities
- maintenance of the State's investment of over \$7.4 billion in its facilities, and
- reduction of energy consumed in state facilities

Construction of new or expanded facilities will be considered lowest priority when evaluating projects. Such projects will only be considered when DFD concludes that:

- there is a need to respond to health and safety problems;
- expansion is necessary to provide adequate space for housing of prisoners or others who are the responsibility of the state;
- consolidation of agency services will increase operational efficiency or reduce state expenditures; or
- replacement of an obsolete structure is more cost effective than renovation.