University of Alaska Anchorage
FY19 Facilities Benchmarking & Analysis
Comprehensive Facilities Intelligence Solutions

FACILITIES ASSESSMENT & PLANNING
Plan and execute capital investment plans that are inclusive, credible, flexible, affordable and sustainable

SPACE UTILIZATION
Ensure your space is working up to its full potential

SUSTAINABILITY SOLUTIONS
Measure and improve environmental stewardship

FACILITIES BENCHMARKING & ANALYSIS
Take control of your facilities and make the case for change without the guesswork
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Vocabulary for Facilities Benchmarking & Analysis

**Annual Stewardship**
The annual investment needed to ensure buildings will properly perform and reach their useful life “*Keep-Up Costs*”. 

**Asset Reinvestment**
The accumulation of repair and modernization needs and the definition of resource capacity to correct them “*Catch-Up Costs*”. 

**Operational Effectiveness**
The effectiveness of the facilities operating budget, staffing, supervision, and energy management. 

**Service**
The measure of service process, the maintenance quality of space and systems, and the customers opinion of service delivery. 

---

**Asset Value Change**

**Operations Success**
University of Alaska – Anchorage Peer Institutions

Return on Physical Assets (ROPA+) includes all space at UAA totaling 3.36 Million GSF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities Peer Institutions</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Maine</td>
<td>Orono, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alaska Fairbanks</td>
<td>Fairbanks, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>Iowa City, IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri – Kansas City</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri – St. Louis</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Gorham, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Chester University of PA</td>
<td>West Chester, PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparative Considerations

Size, technical complexity, region, geographic location, and setting are all factors included in the selection of peer institutions.
Focusing on KPIs

• **Campus Density (FTE/100,000 GSF)** – Includes total on-site student, faculty and staff FTE, and all usable GSF

• **Weighted Renovation Age** – based on age of each building, accounting for major (gut) renovations

• **Facility Condition Index** – calculated using facility condition assessment data (FCI = Backlog / Replacement Value)

• **Energy Consumption (BTU/GSF)** – Total energy consumption (fossil + electric) normalized over GSF

• **Customer Satisfaction** – score derived from annual surveys of campus community
Space Profile
UAA’s Campus has Changed Since 2006

While GSF has increased by more than 40%, enrollment has decreased by 20%

Change in Campus GSF & Enrollment (Indexed to 2006)

- UAA GSF
- UAA Enrolled Students
- Peer GSF
- Peer Enrolled Students

University of Alaska – Anchorage

% Change Since 2006
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Decreasing Enrollment Brings UAA In Line with Peers

Density factor measures the busyness of campus

Change in *Density at UAA

- Users FTE / 100,000 GSF

- *Density Factor

Institutions arranged by Density Factor

*Density is calculated using On-Campus Student FTEs, Faculty FTE, and Staff FTE
Key Performance Indicator: Density

Manage density for efficient use of space

Density Factor

Target: 450 FTE/100,000 GSF

2015  2016  2017  2018  2019

Campus Users / 100,000 GSF

Density  Target  Index
Qualifying Metrics – Technical Complexity

UAA is more complex than peers

Technical Complexity

Areas Impacted by Tech Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy Consumption</th>
<th>Maintenance Staffing</th>
<th>Replacement Values</th>
<th>Stewardship Targets</th>
<th>Operational Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Institutions arranged by Technical Complexity

Tech Rating Distribution

Sightlines Database
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Qualifying Metrics – Building and Grounds Intensity

UAA has larger buildings and fewer buildings per acre than peers

**Building Intensity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>UAA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grounds Intensity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UAA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UAA Maintains a Younger Campus Age

UAA uses new construction to manage campus age

UAA's Renovation Age is 17 years less than Peers
Anchorage & PWSC are Younger through Renovations

Campus Age by Category

- Anchorage
- KPC
- Kodiak
- MatSu
- PWSC
- Peers

△ Construction Age  □ Renovation Age
Balance PM and Reactive Maintenance:
Younger components still require PM.
Aging components require reactive maintenance.

Operational Demands:
Lower Risk:
"Honeymoon" period – little need for capital reinvestment.

Medium Risk:
Lower cost space renewal updates needed.

Higher Risk:
Life Cycles coming due in core building components.

Capital Risk:
Highest Risk:
Life cycles of major components past due – end of building life cycle approaching.

Focus on PM:
Significant need for PM in young systems.

React as Needed:
Issues in components past the end of their lifecycles will demand reactive maintenance.

Operational Demands:  
Capital Risk:  

UAA Has More Low Risk Space Than Peers

Lower risk space affords the opportunity to plan ahead for future needs
Understanding Campus Age

Renovations at Anchorage and PWSC make systems younger

Campus Age by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Age by Category</th>
<th>Under 10</th>
<th>10 to 25</th>
<th>25 to 50</th>
<th>Over 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Construction Age</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Renovation Age</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPC Construction Age</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPC Renovation Age</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak Construction Age</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak Renovation Age</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MatSu Construction Age</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MatSu Renovation Age</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWSC Construction Age</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWSC Renovation Age</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Performance Indicator: Renovation Age

Manage campus age to mitigate risk and maintain functional space

![Graph showing renovation age trend over years]

- **Target: 20 Years**

- **Renovation Age**
  - 2015: 100%
  - 2016: 100%
  - 2017: 99%
  - 2018: 94%
  - 2019: 89%

- **Index**
  - 0%
  - 10%
  - 20%
  - 30%
  - 40%
  - 50%
  - 60%
  - 70%
  - 80%
  - 90%
  - 100%
Understanding the Impact of Age on Future Need

Different construction waves will have competing life cycle needs in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Life Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exteriors</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>25 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital Profile
Capital Funding Sources

**Alaska Terminology**
- Utilities & Grounds & Custodial
- Maintenance & Repair – M&R
- Repair & Renew - R&R

**Fund 1**
- Operations & Maintenance
- Recurring Project Dollars
- One-Time Project Dollars

**Fund 2-9**
- Daily Service & PM
- Annual Stewardship
- Asset Reinvestment

**Sightlines Terminology**
- People
- Expenses
- Utilities
- Recurring Project Dollars
- Annual Stewardship
- One-Time Project Dollars
- Asset Reinvestment
# Sightlines Package Breakouts

Projects are classified by the category of need they are addressing on campus.

## Existing Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Envelope</th>
<th>Building Systems</th>
<th>Space Renewal</th>
<th>Safety/Code</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Non-Facilities</th>
<th>New Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Mechanical Systems</td>
<td>Interior Finishes</td>
<td>ADA Work</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Design Fees</td>
<td>Added GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>HVAC Projects</td>
<td>Replacement of Light Fixtures</td>
<td>Fire/Sprinkler Systems</td>
<td>Underground Piping Work</td>
<td>Feasibility Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointing</td>
<td>Electrical Systems</td>
<td>Furniture Replacement</td>
<td>Security Measures</td>
<td>Softscapes and Hardscapes</td>
<td>IT work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofs</td>
<td>Plumbing Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Lighting and Signage</td>
<td>Offsite Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutters</td>
<td>Elevators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athletic Field Work</td>
<td>Lab Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limited Capital Spending Focused on Existing Space

Existing Space investment has stayed consistent over time

Total Capital Investment

- **Existing Space Investment**: $15.23
- **Infrastructure**: $0
- **Non-Facilities**: $20
- **New Space Investment**: $40
- **Average Existing Space Investment**: 31%

![Graph showing Total Capital Investment from 2006 to 2019 with categories and values]
Defining an Annual Investment Target

Annual Funding Target: $36.2M

FY19 Annual Capital Investment Target

- Replacement Value: $2.2B
- Life Cycle Need represents the total dollars needed to replace components & systems as they come due without accounting for modernization.
- Life Cycle needs are discounted to account for intentional deferral, functional obsolescence, and extended life cycles based on effective maintenance programs.

3% Replacement Value: $66.2

Life Cycle Need:
- $32.9
- $26.3

Annual Investment Target:
- $16.5
- $19.7
In recent years UAA has deferred more to the total backlog of need.

Total Capital Investment vs. Funding Target

- **Decreasing Backlog & Risk**
- **Maintaining Backlog & Risk**
- **Increasing Backlog & Risk**

**Fund 1 Projects: Annual Stewardship**
Funds 2-9 Projects: Asset Reinvestment
Alaska System Capital Investment

The Alaska system has deferred more to the total backlog of need in recent years.
Annual Stewardship has Diminished in Recent Years

UAA’s peers have higher reliability to reach target with more recurring funds

Total Capital Investment as a Percent of Funding Target

- **University of Alaska – Anchorage**
  - Annual Stewardship:
    - 2006: 61%
    - 2007: 61%
    - 2008: 61%
    - 2009: 61%
    - 2010: 61%
    - 2011: 61%
    - 2012: 61%
    - 2013: 61%
    - 2014: 61%
    - 2015: 61%
    - 2016: 61%
    - 2017: 61%
    - 2018: 61%
    - 2019: 61%

- **Peer Institutions**
  - Annual Stewardship:
    - 2006: 72%
    - 2007: 72%
    - 2008: 72%
    - 2009: 72%
    - 2010: 72%
    - 2011: 72%
    - 2012: 72%
    - 2013: 72%
    - 2014: 72%
    - 2015: 72%
    - 2016: 72%
    - 2017: 72%
    - 2018: 72%
    - 2019: 72%

- **Target**
  - 100%

Fund 1 Projects: Annual Stewardship
Funds 2-9 Projects: Asset Reinvestment
Total Asset Reinvestment Need is Greater than Peers

Facilities Assessment to be updated in 2020

Total Asset Reinvestment Need $/GSF

University of Alaska – Anchorage

Peer Institutions
Key Performance Indicator: Facilities Condition Index

Control backlog growth to maintain FCI at 10% and limit risk of system failure

Facilities Condition Index

\[ \text{FCI} = \frac{\text{Backlog}}{\text{Replacement Value}} \]

Target: 10%

Renovation Age  
Target  
Index
Operations Success
Capital Funding Sources

Alaska Terminology

Utilities & Grounds & Custodial

Maintenance & Repair – M&R

Repair & Renew - R&R

Fund 1

Fund 2-9

Projects

Recurring Project Dollars

One-Time Project Dollars

Annual Stewardship

Asset Reinvestment

Operations & Maintenance

People

Expenses

Utilities

Daily Service & PM

Utilities

Sightlines Terminology

Terminology

Capital Funding Sources
Facilities Operating Expenditures vs. Peers

UAA has seen significant reductions in daily service spend since 2011

Facilities Operating Actuals

University of Alaska - Anchorage

Peer Institutions

Daily Service  PM  Avg.
Budget Cuts Limit Purchasing Power

Decreases compared to inflation magnify a challenging trend

Facilities Operating Actuals
Facilities Operating Expenditures vs. Peers

UAA was spending similarly to peers in FY14

Facilities Operating Actuals

COLI Adjusted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$/GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>UAA FY14</th>
<th>UAA FY19</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daily Service
PM
Average
UAA Allocates More Resources to PM than Peers

Increases in PM program yield savings down the road by protecting assets

Preventive Maintenance Spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Preventive Maintenance Spending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preventive Maintenance Spending

% of Total Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>% of Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAA</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best Practice Range
Utility Operating Expenditures Compared to Peers

UAA Utility Spend vs Peers

- **University of Alaska - Anchorage**
- **Peer Institutions**

Fiscal Year: 2006 - 2019
Total Energy Consumption

UAA is consuming less energy than peer institutions since 2015

Total Energy Consumption vs. Peers

University of Alaska – Anchorage

*Peer Institutions
Energy Expenses are Increasing Over Time

Total Energy Cost vs. Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Alaska – Anchorage</th>
<th>Peer Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fossil</td>
<td>$43.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>$31.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$43.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$/MMBTU
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Differences in Unit Costs are Growing vs. Peers

Fossil Fuel Unit Cost

- $/MMBTU
- UAA
- Peers

Electric Unit Cost

- $/kWh
- UAA
- Peers
Key Performance Indicator: Energy BTU per GSF

Focus on energy efficiency will return operational savings and reduce carbon emissions

Energy Consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fossil BTU/GSF</th>
<th>Electric BTU/GSF</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target: 100,000 BTU/GSF
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Staffing levels have recovered slightly for FY19

**Maintenance Staffing**

- GSF: Green line
- FTE: Blue line

**Maintenance Coverage**

- GSF/FTE: 55,892, 57,538, 61,869, 61,869, 61,869, 61,648, 61,869, 60,593, 58,290, 50,251, 70,251, 75,718, 80,426, 76,548

Years: 2006 to 2019
UAA has fewer maintenance supervisors and a slightly lower repair score.

**Maintenance Staffing**

- GSF/FTE: A, B, C, D, E, F, UAA, G, H
- Staffing levels for different institutions.

**Maintenance Supervision**

- FTE/Supervision: A, B, C, D, E, F, UAA, G, H
- Supervision levels for different institutions.

**Maintenance Materials**

- $/GSF: A, B, C, D, E, F, UAA, G, H
- Material costs per square foot for different institutions.

**General Repair/Impression**

- Peers: 3.9
- UAA: 3.9
- Institutions arranged by technical complexity.
Custodial Staffing Coverage

Steady coverage historically, fewer staff in FY19 lead to increased coverage
Custodial Metrics

UAA has fewer custodial staff and a higher cleanliness score than peers

**Custodial Staffing**

- GSF/FTE

**Custodial Supervision**

- FTE/Super

**Custodial Materials**

- $/GSF

**Cleanliness**

- Institutions arranged by Density Rating

$ - $0.20

$0.05 - $0.10

$0.10 - $0.15

$0.15 - $0.20

0 - 10

10 - 20

20 - 30

30 - 40

40 - 50

50 - 60

60 - 70

70 - 80

80 - 90

90 - 100

A B C D E F UAA G H
Grounds Staffing Coverage

Staffing recovery in FY19 reduces coverage

Grounds Staffing

Grounds Coverage

Maintained Acres

FTEs

Acres/FTE


Acres

FTEs

22.3 22.3 22.3 22.3 24.1 22.2 22.2 25.1 28.9 29.1 33.5 32.0
Grounds Metrics

Fewer personnel resources, fewer materials return strong results vs. peers

Grounds Staffing

- UAA: 30 Acres/FTE
- A: 20 Acres/FTE
- B: 10 Acres/FTE
- C: 40 Acres/FTE
- D: 30 Acres/FTE
- E: 20 Acres/FTE
- F: 10 Acres/FTE
- G: 40 Acres/FTE
- H: 30 Acres/FTE

Grounds Supervision

- UAA: 20 FTE/Super
- A: 10 FTE/Super
- B: 5 FTE/Super
- C: 20 FTE/Super
- D: 10 FTE/Super
- E: 5 FTE/Super
- F: 2 FTE/Super
- G: 20 FTE/Super
- H: 10 FTE/Super

Grounds Materials

- UAA: $2,000 $/Acre
- A: $1,500 $/Acre
- B: $2,000 $/Acre
- C: $1,500 $/Acre
- D: $2,000 $/Acre
- E: $1,500 $/Acre
- F: $2,000 $/Acre
- G: $1,500 $/Acre
- H: $2,000 $/Acre

Grounds Inspection Score

- UAA: 4.1
- Peers: 3.9

Institutions arranged by Grounds Intensity
Key Performance Indicator: Customer Satisfaction

Continue to gauge customer satisfaction to manage and meet expectations

Customer Satisfaction

- Target: 85%
- Index: 82% 84% 84% 84% 84%

Customer Satisfaction Index

- Renovation Age
- Target
- Index

- 2015
- 2016
- 2017
- 2018
- 2019
Key Performance Indicators
### KPI Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction Index</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy BTU / GSF</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>123,519</td>
<td>117,427</td>
<td>124,665</td>
<td>117,378</td>
<td>104,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCI</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation Age</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>FY26</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>22.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>FY15 Index</th>
<th>FY16 Index</th>
<th>FY17 Index</th>
<th>FY18 Index</th>
<th>FY19 Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction Index</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy BTU / GSF</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCI</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation Age</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Weighted Index | 73% | 78% | 77% | 78% | 79% |

Key drivers of improvement since FY14 include:
- Reduction in FCI from 17% to 14%
- FY19 reduction in energy consumption
KPI Summary – “One Pager”

Brief description of Key Performance Indicators

Summary chart for visual demonstration of relative improvement or decrease in index scores

Summary table of metrics including annual values, target values, weighting and index scores.

University of Alaska Anchorage
KPI Summary

University of Alaska Anchorage focuses on five key metrics to drive the evaluation of performance improvement over time. These metrics are:

- Customer satisfaction score derived from annual surveys of campus community
- Weighted Renovation Age based on usage of each building, accounting for major capital renovations
- Energy Consumption (BTU/GSF) - Total energy consumption (BTU) related to a normalized square foot (SF)
- Facilities Condition Index calculated using field condition assessments and dilapidation index (FCC - Decline in Property Value)
- Campus Density (FTE/100,000 GSF) - Includes internal site, student, faculty and student (FTE), and all usable (GSC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY15 Index</th>
<th>FY16 Index</th>
<th>FY17 Index</th>
<th>FY18 Index</th>
<th>FY19 Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction Index</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (FTE/100,000 GSF)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy BTU per GSF</td>
<td>123,357</td>
<td>117,617</td>
<td>124,665</td>
<td>117,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation Age</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>FY15 Index</th>
<th>FY16 Index</th>
<th>FY17 Index</th>
<th>FY18 Index</th>
<th>FY19 Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction Index</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy BTU per GSF</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation Age</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 21% 7% 7% 7% 7%

Weighted Index: 71% 78% 77% 78% 79%