

SCFP SUBCOMMITTEE ON TWIN CITIES FACILITIES AND SUPPORT  
SERVICES (STCFSS)  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
APRIL 20, 2004

[In these minutes: Twin Cities Facilities Condition Assessment Report, Brainstorm on Agenda Items for 2004 – 2005]

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Calvin Alexander, chair, Edward Kosciolk, Carrie Meyer, Steve Fitzgerald, Laurie Scheich, Steve Spehn, Gary A. Davis, Gordon Girtz, Gary Jahn, Patrice Morrow, George Wilcox, Jennifer Hannaford

REGRETS: Sharon Folk, Dan Allen, John Adams, Brian Horgan

ABSENT: Donald Kelsey, Lorelee Wederstrom

I). Professor Alexander called the meeting to order. He announced that today's agenda will consist of a Twin Cities Facilities Condition Assessment presentation by Steve Spehn followed by a brainstorming session on agenda items for next year.

II). Professor Alexander called on Steve Spehn to share with the Committee information on the most recent Twin Cities Facilities Condition Assessment (FCA). Mr. Spehn highlighted the following:

- ISES, a consulting firm that specializes in assessing higher education facilities, was used to conduct the assessment.
- The purpose of the Facilities Condition Assessment (FCA) was to identify the facilities' needs that will come due in the next 10 years.
- Past assessments were based on a depreciation model. This model did not allow for information based on actual physical inspections. The most recent FCA, however, incorporates aspects of the depreciation model while integrating the inspection process.
- Information collected will be stored in a central repository. Facilities Management will maintain this database.
- The information collected will serve as a tool for master planning, facilities programming, capital planning, capital financial planning and budget forecasting. Additionally, this information will assist the Board of Regents in their stewardship responsibilities.
- Over 220 buildings were inspected on the Twin Cities campus. Inspections included: building interiors and exteriors, mechanical, electrical and plumbing, fire/life/safety, handicapped accessibility, energy conservation opportunities, high

voltage vaults as well as a few special inspections e.g. classrooms, elevators and security.

- The University's utility distribution system was not inspected as part of this assessment.
- The coordinate campuses have expressed an interest in conducting their own FCAs.
- Thirty five percent of the buildings on campus are 60 years old or more, 11% of the buildings on campus are 100 or more years old and 72% are 30 years old or more. At the point when buildings are around 30 years old, many need their original systems replaced.
- The University has done a good job identifying and fixing the immediate needs of buildings on the Twin Cities campus.
- The University has been very successful at extending the useful life of existing building systems beyond what should be expected by industry experts.
- The size of the approaching facilities' needs and the financial resources that will be needed to address these needs will require new strategies.
- Compared to the average ISES client, the University of Minnesota has slightly more deficiencies that need replacing than similar institutions.
- The University will need \$1.7 billion over the next 10 years to address the facilities' needs uncovered in the FCA. Supported space will require \$1.36 billion and non-supported space will require \$.34 billion. (The University has two types of space on campus, supported and non-supported. Supported space includes programs where the University pays for building operations, maintenance and building renewal with centrally allocated funds. Non-supported space includes auxiliary programs that are required to finance their own facilities costs e.g. parking, housing, food service, student unions, athletics, etc.)
- Charts depicting project costs by priority classes, system codes, and project classification were shared.
- FCA data is being used to:
  - Set HEAPR (Higher Education Asset Preservation and Replacement) and R & R (repair and replacements) funding priorities.
  - Provide Capital Planning with information used in pre-designs.
  - Provide central budget office and academic units with FCA findings to assist with strategic decision-making.
- To address the needs that have been uncovered the University has:
  - Increased its basic HEAPR request to \$80 million in 2000 and 2002 and to \$90 million in 2004. (Prior to 2000, the HEAPR request was never more than \$30 million).
  - Made it a priority to renovate instead of building new facilities.
  - Targeted institutional resources towards high priority needs.
  - Developed and maintained buildings to adequate maintenance standards.
  - Increased annual funding for preventive and repair maintenance (over time).
- Next steps include:
  - Use FCA data as a tool for decision-making.
  - Develop strategies to manage approaching needs.

- Use the information collected for strategic planning and integrating the information into the decision-making process.

Mr. Spehn concluded his presentation and members discussed the information that was shared.

III). Next, Professor Alexander encouraged members to think about what the Committee would like to accomplish next year. Ideas generated are below:

- Keep a close eye on classroom issues.
- Learn more about what it costs the University to fix early design mistakes. Attempt to capture these costs so that a case can be made that more time and money needs to be allocated to pre-design.
- Invite VP O'Brien and/or Capital Planning & Project Management (CPPM) to discuss the changes that have been instituted related to design methodology and learn how the reorganization is going.
- Focus on the buildings on campus that have been successes and compare these facilities to buildings that are not operating to par. By doing so the University can learn from its mistakes.
- Learn about the design process and what CPPM is doing to catch mistakes early in the design process. Are changes to the design process since the CPPM reorganization making a difference?
- Invite Duluth Facilities Management Director John King to learn about Duluth's design methodology. Based on what the Committee has heard, it seems like Duluth catches mistakes earlier in the design stage.
- Look into the impact a new Gopher stadium would have on parking.
- Learn about the changes that are being made to the University's Energy Conservation Program.
- Brainstorm on how the Committee can get the University administration to use the skills and talents that are represented by the faculty and students in the design process. How can the University make use of its internal knowledge to bear on some of its facilities' problems?

IV). Professor Alexander distributed a copy of next year's STCFSS meeting schedule. This schedule will also be emailed to members.

V). Hearing no further business, Professor Alexander adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate