



UNIVERSITY  
*of* ALASKA

---

*Many Traditions One Alaska*

## **Facilities Report**

April 11, 2017



## Table of contents

Team Charge, Members and Stakeholders .....	1
Process Overview.....	2
Team Introduction.....	3
Option 1 – Consolidation at The Statewide Level or at One University .....	4
Option 2 – Increased Contracting of Facilities Services.....	10
Option 3 – Reinstate Chief Facilities Officer/Associate Vice PResident of Facilities and Enhance Inter-University.....	14
Other Opportunities for Change.....	18
Appendix.....	19



## **Team Charge, Scope and Goal, Members and Stakeholders**

### **Charge**

Develop and review options for organizational restructuring including but not limited to further decentralization, consolidation at one of the three universities (UAA, UAF or UAS), or consolidation at Statewide of functions that support improvements in service and cost effectiveness through outsourcing, automation, inter-university collaboration, process standardization, and other means to be determined by the team.

### **Scope**

All Facilities functions.

### **Goal**

Optimize resources and align with UA priorities.

### **Team Members**

- ▶ Mike Abels
- ▶ Scott Bell
- ▶ Ryan Buchholdt
- ▶ Melissa Clark
- ▶ James Dougherty
- ▶ Alan Fugleberg
- ▶ Keith Gerken
- ▶ Lisa Hoferkamp
- ▶ Luke Hopkins
- ▶ Rorik Peterson
- ▶ Chris Turletes
- ▶ Chrystal Warmoth

### **Key Stakeholders**

- ▶ Students
- ▶ Faculty
- ▶ Staff
- ▶ Executive Leadership
- ▶ Community
- ▶ Employers
- ▶ Parents
- ▶ Alumni
- ▶ Legislators
- ▶ Federal Agency Partners



## Process Overview

The University Facilities Team is one of seven teams in Phase 3 of Strategic Pathways. Phase 3 began in January 2017 when the teams met for the first time on January 31 in Anchorage. During the first session there was a thorough orientation to the overall group, the charge, scope, and goal were generally defined. Each of the 7 teams broke down to their respective areas where team introductions were made and facilities representatives from each University talked about how they were organized now and how they were similar and how they were different. Each University talked about the level of activity currently contracted out. Session one finished up with 5 possible options, and after dropping one option, moved forward to flesh out the four remaining options. We met weekly in teleconferences to discuss each of the options parameters. On February 28<sup>th</sup>, we had our second face-to-face meeting where we developed pros and cons for each of the options. Since then, the Facilities team has been refining the pros and cons virtually and through weekly teleconferences. This report serves as the main source of information for the Strategic Pathways Phase 3 --Facilities presentation to the Summit Team on April 11, 2017.

## **Team Introduction**

The Facilities Team consists of 12 people and is derived from Fairbanks and Anchorage community members, a UAF student, and staff and faculty from the universities. There is representation from Statewide, each of the Universities (UAA, UAF, UAS), one person from the Research entities (Toolik), and a Community Campus Director (Kodiak). The Facilities Directors from each of the Universities were among the participants. Two faculty participated, one from Natural Sciences at UAS, and one from Engineering at UAF.

## **Current Situation Overview**

Facilities organizations are defined and structured differently at each university and at Statewide. Each university maintains much of its maintenance and operations function at the university level and consolidates the Planning, Design and Construction Management offices at the university level. UAF operates a central heat and power plant; other universities buy utilities (refuse pickup, fuel, gas, electricity, hydro, wind; and in some instances, water and sewer service) from local utility companies. Each of the universities have unionized craft and trade workforces to accomplish the maintenance, operations and power plant work. UAF has the largest staff and the most property of the UA system. Each university contracts out specialized services such as: domestic and fire water supply and sewage treatment, building automation, elevator oil, lube, and repair, custodial, augmentation of maintenance and operations activities (i.e., extra and/or specialized assistance), most design services, new construction services, and renovation/minor construction/heavy maintenance (via task order contract). UAA and UAS maintain Campus Environmental Health and Safety, Risk Management and Emergency Management offices as auxiliary functions within Facilities. These functions are separate non-Facilities departments at UAF.

## **Option 1 – Consolidation at The Statewide Level or at One University**

### **Narrative Description**

“Consolidation at the Statewide Level”, and “Consolidation at One University” (at UAA, UAF or UAS) were originally considered as two options. Because the two options have many similarities they are consolidated here as Options 1a and 1b to eliminate duplication of the Key Change Elements and the Pros and Cons of each option.

### **Option 1a – Consolidation at the Statewide Level**

Statewide would fill the Chief Facilities Officer, also known as CFAO, (note: the addition of the A in CFAO is not representative of a word rather differentiates the title from CFO Chief Finance Officer) position and the University Facilities Directors would report directly to the CFAO. CFAO would report directly to the UA President or to a Vice President. Minimal reporting changes would occur at the university level. The CFAO and the university directors would collaborate on strategy, standardization of process and policies. Each director would coordinate closely with their respective chancellor on facilities priorities and operations at their university.

This option could eliminate some duplicative Facilities Services (FS) functions, consolidate some functions, and leave others distributed at each university. Functions more easily centralized include planning, design and project management, customer service and work order management, and preventive maintenance asset management, scheduling and tracking. Maintenance and operations would be better managed at each university. The Office of Planning, Design and Construction would be at Statewide.

### **Option 1b – Consolidation at One University**

This option would be similar to option 1a (Consolidation at the Statewide Level), however the role of CFAO would be assigned to one of the university Directors. Under Option 1a, CFAO functions are centralized at statewide, under Option 1b functions are centralized at the CFAO’s university.

## *Option 1 continued – Consolidation at The Statewide Level or at One University*

### **Key Change Elements Common to both 1a and 1b**

- ▶ **Organizational Structure Changes**
  - Facilities would be split from Land Management.
- ▶ **Program/Offering Changes**
  - Provide a centralized facilities needs review when duplicating or expanding standardized research or academic programs to another university.
- ▶ **Staffing Changes**
  - Minimal changes in staffing with the exception of those functions which could now be combined. Possible restructuring of university administrative positions to a central group. Functions that could feasibly be combined and centralized would provide for reductions in staff (e.g. call centers, sustainability)
  - Reduced facilities staffing as similar work efforts are centralized. System-wide specialized work programs to standardize quality of work for example, central preventative maintenance scheduling and tracking.
- ▶ **Use of Facilities/Technology**
  - A possible adjustment in technology for certain locations to best fit the other universities (e.g. AiM used by UAA and UAF). Standardization of software between universities.
  - Increased use of communications technologies (e.g., Skype) and software platforms.
- ▶ **Access for Students**
  - Further analysis needed.
- ▶ **University Administration**
  - Could have some reduction if duplicate positions are combined.
- ▶ **Service Contracts**
  - Possible reduction in the number of university contracts. Larger procurement pool allows greater competition.
- ▶ **Operating Budget**
  - One budget for all universities, resulting in a larger central FS budget and smaller university FS budgets. Budget is used for best/highest needs within the system.
- ▶ **Capital Budget**
  - One budget for all universities. Budget is used for best/highest needs within the system. Potential to streamline approval processes.
- ▶ **Community (external) Engagement**
  - Responsibility for community and external engagement would be directed by the lead office (either Statewide or the lead University). Further analysis is needed to identify the most efficient and effective organizational structure.
- ▶ **Responsive Maintenance**
  - Further analysis needed.
- ▶ **External Funding**
  - No change



*Option 1 continued – Consolidation at The Statewide Level or at One University*

**Key Change Elements of Option 1a only**

- ▶ Organizational Structure Changes
  - University facilities organizations would report to Statewide. There would be a dotted line from each director to their respective chancellor.
- ▶ Program/Offering Changes
  - Facility planning function reports to Statewide.
- ▶ Statewide Administration
  - CFAO position would need to be filled. Minimal Statewide staff added to support the CFAO. Statewide leadership would focus on strategy, policy and support to the universities.
- ▶ Front-End Investment
  - Filling the vacant position of CFAO
- ▶ Planning Design Construction and Management
  - Centralized at Statewide, while construction management is at the university level.
- ▶ Preventative Maintenance
  - Preventive maintenance scheduling, work order creation, and tracking could be consolidated at Statewide. More analysis needed.
- ▶ Design and Construction Standards
  - Managed at Statewide



## *Option 1 continued – Consolidation at The Statewide Level or at One University*

### **Key Change Elements of Option 1b only**

- ▶ **Organizational Structure Changes**
  - University facilities organizations would report to the lead university. There would be a dotted line from each director to their respective chancellor.
- ▶ **Campus Administration**
  - Increase of administration at lead university and reduction of administration at non-lead universities. Reporting lines and responsibilities would change.
- ▶ **Statewide Administration**
  - Reduced need for current or future Statewide administrators. Some Statewide staff may move to the lead university.
- ▶ **Front-End Investment**
  - Staff and process reorganization would require an investment in training, software standardizations, records and inventory control, etc.
- ▶ **Planning Design Construction and Management**
  - Centralized at the lead university, while construction management is at all three universities.
- ▶ **Preventative Maintenance**
  - Preventive maintenance scheduling, work order creation, and tracking could be consolidated at the lead university. More analysis needed.
- ▶ **External Funding**
  - Further analysis needed.
- ▶ **Design and Construction Standards**
  - Managed at lead university.

## *Option 1 continued – Consolidation at The Statewide Level or at One University*

### **Pros and Cons Common to Both 1a and 1b**

#### **Pros**

- ▶ Strategic alignment of activities
- ▶ Optimization of resources
- ▶ More direct decision making process
- ▶ Single access to decision makers
- ▶ Consistency across universities
- ▶ Economies of scale in procurement
- ▶ Brings a pyramid org chart that provides clarity of how to distribute limited future funding
- ▶ Centralized functions to track work processes for common overview/evaluation
- ▶ Facilities planning, design and overall project management would be centrally directed and more efficient.
- ▶ Onsite contract management would provide the best oversight of construction, remodel and heavy/major repairs at each university
- ▶ Provide a consistent, fair and easily communicated review of new research proposals for facility impacts to better align with expected UA or university funding
- ▶ Maintains a facility council structure
- ▶ Larger groups of similar facilities may make Public-Private Partnership (P3) contracts more feasible.

#### **Cons**

- ▶ Elimination of vice chancellors and chancellors from decision making process
- ▶ Less responsive to university needs
- ▶ Less responsive to external community needs
- ▶ Decisions affecting university programs likely will take longer
- ▶ Removal of planning function from the separately accredited universities jeopardizes the ability/agility to accommodate accreditation requirements
- ▶ There could be more emphasis on statewide priorities than on priorities of the universities.
- ▶ Could lose individual university unity when office functions are consolidated at Statewide or one university.
- ▶ Potential loss of institutional knowledge or data when converting to common facilities management software.
- ▶ Previous attempts at centralized facilities planning, design and construction management services were unsuccessful. Chancellors wanted more control of facilities developments on their universities.
- ▶ Personalized aspect of service could be diminished

## *Option 1 continued – Consolidation at The Statewide Level or at One University*

### **Pros and Cons Common to Both 1a and 1b, continued**

#### **Pros**

#### **Cons**

- ▶ Response time to service calls might increase
- ▶ Centralized service contracts for the entire UA system may attract larger vendors but disadvantage local vendors.
- ▶ The centrally-controlled operating and capital budgets could be quickly reallocated between universities to meet emergency needs, disrupting maintenance and renewal plans at each one.

### **Additional Option 1a Pros and Cons**

#### **Pros**

#### **Cons**

- ▶ Statewide is closer to Board of Regents
- ▶ Statewide is a neutral location for consolidation
- ▶ Brings a Statewide org chart that could better distribute limited future resources
- ▶ Public perception of high level position creation
- ▶ Will grow Statewide

### **Further Analysis Needed**

- ▶ What impact will this have on accreditation (Statewide does not have accreditation)?
- ▶ Centralized customer service would need to be implemented in a way that does not impact service levels.
- ▶ Would need to develop a committee/governance structure to allow for input from universities.
- ▶ Costs and time comparisons to develop a hierarchical reporting authority in Facilities Planning Design & Construction needs further evaluation.
- ▶ May need more robust two-way information exchange between students (i.e. customers) and centralized FS via smartphone/Facetime, texting reply, etc.

## Option 2 – Increased Contracting of Facility Services

### Narrative Description

Facilities Services across UA are extensive, and activities vary between the three universities. Many activities are currently outsourced (custodial at UAA and UAF, elevator maintenance, design services, major or specialized new and renewal construction work), but there is potential for further outsourcing.

Further analysis is required for areas of potential outsourcing. This option does not assume a complete outsourcing of all facilities functions. The university retains inherent responsibilities such as ownership, regulatory compliance, planning and resource allocation that make complete outsourcing unlikely.

In any further contracting of facilities activities, the university would retain ownership responsibilities of quality assurance and institutional planning (including master planning, space management, and capital planning).

Areas of potential contracting – (further analysis required on each):

- Maintenance (preventative and reactive)
- Operations (grounds, snow plowing, custodial)
- Utilities
- Architecture/Engineering services, design services, and construction
- Project management

### Key Change Elements

- ▶ Program/Offering Changes
  - Adjustment of contract terms will be required to meet academic and administrative program changes.
- ▶ Staffing Changes
  - Reduction in facilities employees as activities are shifted to contractors. Addition of service contract manager position(s) would be required.
- ▶ Use of Facilities/Technology
  - Further analysis is required; impact to facilities and technology depends on implementation.
- ▶ Access for Students
  - Further analysis needed to determine how faculty, staff and students request services within the new system.
  - For maintenance and operations, access to services would be through the contractor. For planning, design, and construction, access would be through staff project managers.

## *Option 2 continued – Increased Contracting of Facility Services*

### **Key Change Elements, continued**

- ▶ University Administration
  - Further analysis required to determine extent of quality assurance activities. Administrative authority lines would change. Likely to reduce university administration.
- ▶ Statewide Administration
  - Potential impact if contracts are centrally managed.
- ▶ Service Contracts
  - The number of service contracts will fluctuate depending on how the contracting option is implemented. If a full-service maintenance contractor is engaged, the number of service contracts (elevators, fire systems, automation systems, etc.) can potentially decrease for the university as the contractor assumes those responsibilities.
- ▶ Operating Budget
  - Operating funds will shift from funding in-sourced activities to supporting the costs of contracts. Further analysis required to determine if there is a positive or negative impact on the operating budget.
- ▶ Capital Budget
  - The responsibility for securing capital funding remains with UA.
  - Public-Private Partnerships (P3s) could include financing of outsourcing of facilities construction and maintenance, shifting facilities financing from the capital budget to the operating budget.
- ▶ Front-End Investment
  - Initial costs related to requests for proposal (RFP) development, stakeholder consultation, and development of additional contract administration resources.
- ▶ Community (external) Engagement
  - Impact unknown.
- ▶ Responsive Maintenance
  - Responsive maintenance becomes the responsibility of the vendor.
- ▶ Planning Design Construction and Management
  - Planning remains with the university. Design services and construction would be executed through contractors. The university would retain staff to manage the contracts.
- ▶ Preventative Maintenance
  - Preventative maintenance executed by the vendor.
- ▶ External Funding
  - Further analysis is required as impacts depend on implementation. For example, eligibility for federal research funding is influenced by the level of facilities services provided.
- ▶ Design and Construction Standards
  - Remains the responsibility of the university.

## *Option 2 continued – Increased Contracting of Facility Services*

### **Key Change Elements, continued**

- ▶ Work Management System, Customer Service, Accounting
  - Customer Service becomes the responsibility of the contractor. Further analysis required on the Work Management System impacts.
- ▶ Procurement
  - Procurement administration requirements will change as activities are outsourced.

### **Pros and Cons**

#### **Pros**

- ▶ Competition among vendors could reduce costs
- ▶ Administrative leadership could focus on education mission
- ▶ Contract terms would greater ensure that preventative maintenance does not compete with other spending priorities.
- ▶ Greater perception that public money is moving to the private sector. May strengthen business community's support for university.
- ▶ Would reduce the number of university employees
- ▶ Reduces recruitment, training, and retention resources (Human Resources and other administrative functions)
- ▶ Reduce capital inventory
- ▶ Reduction in maintenance, insurance, and equipment costs
- ▶ Increased investment in private sector increases community tax revenue

#### **Cons**

- ▶ Quality may be harder to maintain
- ▶ It is challenging to end or modify a contract with a poor contractor
- ▶ Private sector cost may be higher initially and may include annual increases
- ▶ Unknown impact from the cost of adding work outside the scope of the contract
- ▶ Contractors may cost more than in-house personnel for emergency and priority responses
- ▶ Loss of employee connectedness to the institutional mission and values
- ▶ Loss of institutional knowledge
- ▶ Impact on work study and student employment opportunities
- ▶ Difficult to respond to emerging academic needs
- ▶ Would need to follow contract language regarding contracted work with the craft and trades union
- ▶ Upfront cost associated with initiating a contract

## *Option 2 continued – Increased Contracting of Facility Services*

### **Pros and Cons, continued**

#### **Pros**

#### **Cons**

- ▶ Learning curve and potential disruption associated with major change
- ▶ University would need a knowledgeable team of contract managers
- ▶ High degree of disruption when vendors are changed

### **Further Analysis Needed**

- ▶ Are contracts managed centrally at Statewide or by each university? This may vary depending on what activities are outsourced.
- ▶ With a maintenance contractor, does the vendor provide their own work management system, or does the university provide it? It raises the question of data continuity across contracts.
- ▶ Any contract written could be established to mandate offering positions to existing university employees.
- ▶ The impacts on UA's Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) obligations due to a large reduction in workforce.
- ▶ Potentially some administrative and/or industrial space may be freed up if the activities are contracted out and the space is not included as part of the contract

## **Option 3 – Reinstate Chief Facilities Officer/Associate Vice President of Facilities and Enhance Inter-University Collaboration**

### **Narrative Description**

Statewide would fill the Chief Facilities Officer (CFAO) (at the associate vice president level) position and the University Facilities Directors would coordinate/collaborate with this position. Directors would work for their respective universities. Their operating budget is derived from the university that they serve. Minimal changes would occur on the university level. The CFAO and the directors would collaborate on strategy, priority, approvals, standardization of process and policies. The CFAO would be the liaison/advisor for the universities to the President and the regents. CFAO would advise/collaborate with University Administration on land and facilities strategic decisions. The point of service accountability and responsibility is still at the university level. University planning, design and construction would be at the university level. Facilities operations and maintenance would remain at the university level. Where practical, term contracts, task order contracts, service contracts, and bulk procurements should be coordinated and made available to interested universities. Regular Facilities Council meetings and Facilities Maintenance and Operations meetings/workshops should be established to share ideas, processes and procedures and expertise.

### **Key Change Elements**

- ▶ Program/Offering Changes
  - No impact on academic program offerings.
  - Facilities support programs. As programs expand or contract on a university or relocate to another university, the associated space requirements move with the program.
- ▶ Staffing Changes
  - Would minimize changes to current staffing. Share specialized technical expertise across universities. Maintain core capabilities or at least first responder ability at each university.
- ▶ Use of Facilities/Technology
  - Leverage technologies, such as common platforms and subscriptions; create workgroups
- ▶ Access for Students
  - No change
- ▶ Campus Administration
  - Facilities functions need to be accountable to all universities (including community campuses)
- ▶ Statewide Administration
  - Statewide facilities/lands positions need to be kept or re-established for current system to work. Statewide would manage facilities and related land management issues that need to be forwarded for regents approvals (including policy/approvals) but retain all aspects of operations at university level.



*Option 3 continued – Reinstate Chief Facilities Officer/Associate Vice President of Facilities and Enhance Inter-University Collaboration*

**Key Change Elements, continued**

- ▶ Service Contracts
  - Leverage centralized volume for cost when it makes sense. Decentralize for local oversight and control. Local support personnel are more knowledgeable of service providers who might not otherwise respond to solicitation.
- ▶ Operating Budget
  - Universities retain operating budget responsibility
  - Statewide would need to allocate operating funds to universities and project approval authority to the CFAO position per regents policy.
  - Centralized when asking for funds (direct or bonding) from legislature.
- ▶ Capital Budget
  - Current environment requires capital budget prioritization and policy approvals. This coordination between universities needs to stay at the Statewide level. Requirements, planning, and execution should remain at university level.
  - Centralized when asking for funds (direct or bonding) from legislature, decentralized for private foundation/grants capital project requests
- ▶ Front-End Investment
  - Funding for a Chief Facilities Officer
- ▶ Community (external) Engagement
  - Local community awareness and relationships are maintained
- ▶ Responsive Maintenance
  - Universities retain responsibility for maintenance and operations of their sites
- ▶ Planning Design Construction and Management
  - Universities retain the responsibility for planning, design, and construction management at their sites.
- ▶ Preventative Maintenance
  - Universities retain responsibility for preventative maintenance of their sites
- ▶ External Funding
  - Take advantage of opportunities at both central (big corporate donors and local donors) and decentralized levels. Grants tend to be local; some research could be across the universities.
- ▶ Design and Construction Standards
  - Decentralized and location specific to each university and their remote locations. (e.g., parts and systems standardization like all door hardware standardized). All sites fall under different local ordinances and codes. Contract documents, requests for proposals language, and term contracts could be standardized.

*Option 3 continued – Reinstate Chief Facilities Officer/Associate Vice President of Facilities and Enhance Inter-University Collaboration*

**Pros and Cons**

**Pros**

- ▶ Ensures responsiveness to university priorities by maintaining local control and flexibility
- ▶ Balances a consistent, single point of contact within Statewide and for the Board, while maintaining university leadership's role in the management of each university's physical requirements.
- ▶ Standardization of policy
- ▶ Standardization of statewide goals, guiding principles and priorities.
- ▶ Enhances existing Facilities Council by increasing collaboration
- ▶ Greater information sharing between Maintenance and Operation leadership at the universities
- ▶ Increased flexibility to respond to institutional structural needs
- ▶ Improved communication, coordination, and collaboration between the universities, maximizing effectiveness of existing facilities expertise across the UA system.
- ▶ Opportunity to save money on smaller scale local projects (Localization of smaller scale projects allows for smaller contractors to be competitive, potentially saving money and increasing external engagement)

**Cons**

- ▶ This is not a major change
- ▶ Unlikely to reduce cost
- ▶ Over centralization of project approvals and inter-university collaboration could reduce flexibility
- ▶ Reinstates an executive-class employee at Statewide



*Option 3 continued – Reinstate Chief Facilities Officer/Associate Vice President of Facilities and Enhance Inter-University Collaboration*

**Pros and Cons, continued**

**Pros**

- ▶ Maintains current staff and university relationships
- ▶ Maintains existing local external community and industry relationships
- ▶ A single facilities member acting on behalf of facilities related issues at a senior level (Board of Regents, State Legislature, etc.)
- ▶ Does not require a large investment to make changes
- ▶ Easiest to implement while continuing to provide service
- ▶ Maintains institutional knowledge
- ▶ Minimal disruption
- ▶ Allows for local experimentation

**Cons**

**Further Analysis Needed**

- ▶ Would the reinstatement of the CFAO position include Land Management?

## Other Opportunities for Change

- ▶ Impacts of Strategic Pathways Phase 3 decisions for Risk Management, Land Management and Finance may impact this area.
- ▶ Increased collaboration at the universities and among the universities.
- ▶ Continue to engage in such organizations as Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA) and Education Advisory Board (EAB)'s Facilities Forum to be aware of industry successes and best practices in Facilities Services. Maintain our relationship with Sightlines to benchmark our spending against our peers and help develop campus specific strategies to maximize limited resources.
- ▶ Create Statewide capital project approval committee based on the Anchorage and Fairbanks metropolitan area transportation planning committees (AMATS/FMATS) model for dispersing capital funds that would have a committee to discuss, evaluate and vote on capital facility improvements across the system and present outcome to the regents.
- ▶ Day-to-day trouble repairs and call-ins to a centralized “other university” location could better manage “dispatching”.
- ▶ All universities could have common personnel radio communications equipment under one statewide contract.
- ▶ Users could be texting requests to a common app or calling an 800 number to get continued service updates on repairs.

## Appendix

- ▶ Appendix 1: Current Facilities Organization and Responsibilities at each University

### UAA:

#### Reports to the Chancellor through the VC for Administrative Services

##### F&CS Mission

- ▶ “Provide safe, quality, cost effective, and expert support to UAA.”
- ▶ We do this by:
  - Operating and maintaining the physical environment
  - Sustainable transportation services
  - Planning, constructing, and renovating facilities
  - Providing the University’s master planning
  - Protecting the University’s property interests
  - Providing a safe and comfortable environment for our students, faculty, staff, and community
  - Managing the university’ sustainability activities
- ▶ Participating in several university committees, including: Safety; Facilities, Space, and Planning Committee, Planning and Budget Advisory Council, and Sustainability.
- ▶ Committed to stewardship of the natural environment
  - Tree Campus USA designation since 2009
  - No Net Tree Loss —445 seedlings planted for every acre cleared due to new construction
- ▶ 87 full-time staff (37 professional and 50 Local 6070)
- ▶ Annual operating budget is about \$18.8 million

##### Facilities & Campus Services

- ▶ Associate Vice Chancellor: Chris Turletes, CFM
- ▶ 4 staff
- ▶ Provides department fiscal and strategic management and support
- ▶ Manages the Anchorage campus’ central utilities budget
- ▶ Manages campus sustainability activities

##### Facilities Maintenance & Operations

- ▶ Director: Tom Sternberg, CFM
- ▶ 15 staff and 50 Local 6070 + seasonal hires
- ▶ Responsible for the day-to-day maintenance and operations of the Anchorage campus

## **Facilities Planning & Construction**

- ▶ Director: Kim Mahoney, P.E.
- ▶ 10 project management and support staff
- ▶ Manages the planning, development, and execution of capital, deferred maintenance and renewal projects for all UAA campuses
- ▶ Maintains UAA's space and facilities data

## **Environmental, Health, Safety, and Risk Management**

- ▶ Director: Doug Markussen, P.E.
- ▶ 3 staff
- ▶ Ensures UAA activities are conducted in a safe, managed-risk manner.
- ▶ Activities include: safety assessments and trainings, chemical hygiene and waste disposal, emergency management, and certificates of insurance.

What UAA currently outsources:

- ▶ Utilities, custodial, fire systems inspections and maintenance, elevator maintenance, building automation systems, off-site snow plowing, augmentation of maintenance and operations activities (i.e., extra and/or specialized assistance), A/E services, new construction services, renovation/minor construction/heavy maintenance (via task order contract), special inspections, hazardous material inspection and remediation, other miscellaneous needs.

## **UAF**

Facilities services reports to the UAF Chancellor through the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services

## **Facilities Services' Mission**

"Promoting excellence in education and research as we build, maintain, and enhance UAF's infrastructure."

- ▶ We do this by:
  - Operating and maintaining the physical environment
  - Operating a combined heat and power plant and distributing utilities across the Fairbanks campus
  - Operating the shuttle system and maintaining the physical environment
  - Sustainable transportation services
  - Planning, designing, constructing, and renovating facilities
  - Providing campus' master planning
  - Protecting the University's property interests
  - Providing a safe and comfortable environment for our students, faculty, staff, and community

- Operating waste and recycled material collection system
- Operating Fairbanks campuses' mail system
- ▶ Participate in university committees, including: Safety; Space Utilization; Master Planning; North Campus; Planning and Budget Committee; and Student Sustainability.
- ▶ Committed to stewardship of the natural environment
- ▶ Tree Campus USA designation since 2011
- ▶ 186 full-time staff (76 professional and 110 Local 6070) and 35 students
- ▶ FY17 operating budget is \$39.3 million
- ▶ FY17 capital budget is about \$145 million

### **Administration and Financial Services**

- ▶ Associate Vice Chancellor: Scott Bell, P.E.
- ▶ Finance Director: Kellie Fritze
- ▶ 20 staff
- ▶ Provides department fiscal and strategic management and support
- ▶ Manages In-house procurement up to \$25K
- ▶ Manages university sustainability activities
- ▶ Safety Officer reports to AVCFS

### **Facilities Maintenance Division**

- ▶ Superintendent: Bill Cox
- ▶ 78 staff of which 50 are Local 6070, plus seasonal hires
- ▶ Responsible for the day-to-day maintenance of all UAF campuses, including UA statewide facilities on the Fairbanks campus

### **Facilities Operations Division**

- ▶ Superintendent: Darrin Edson
- ▶ 31 staff, of which 18 are Local 6070, plus seasonal hires
- ▶ Responsible for the day-to-day operations of the Fairbanks campuses

### **Division of Design and Construction**

- ▶ Director: Jennifer Campbell, P.E.
- ▶ 40 project management, construction management and support staff
- ▶ Manages the planning, design, and construction of new construction, deferred maintenance and renewal projects for all UAF facilities
- ▶ Maintains UAF's space use and facilities condition databases

## **Utilities Division**

- ▶ Director: Charles Ward, P.E.
- ▶ 35 staff, of which 23 are Local 6070, plus seasonal hires
- ▶ Ensures the Fairbanks campus is provided with safe, reliable and economical heat, power, water and sewer services.
- ▶ Operates the combined heat and power plant.

## **Auxiliaries and Contract Management**

- ▶ Director: Martin Klein
- ▶ 28 staff, of which 11 are Local 6070, plus seasonal hires
- ▶ Operates the shuttle bus system
- ▶ Manages the custodial contract, campus shuttle system, vehicle fleet (including repairs), mail services, and central receiving

## **What UAF currently outsources:**

- ▶ Fairbanks Campus: Domestic and Fire Water supply and sewage treatment, custodial, elevator maintenance, building automation systems (digital control of HVAC systems), augmentation of maintenance and operations activities (i.e., extra and/or specialized assistance), new construction services, renovation/minor construction/heavy maintenance (via task order contract), special inspections, other miscellaneous needs.
- ▶ Other campuses: Same as at the Fairbanks Campus plus electrical power is purchased from private utilities.

## **UAS**

### **Reports to the Chancellor thru the VC for Administrative services**

#### **UAS Facilities Services Mission**

- ▶ Provide safe, comfortable, functional and cost effective facilities and services to the three UAS campuses.
- ▶ We do this by:
  - Planning, designing constructing, operating, and maintaining the physical campus infrastructure
  - Providing convenient transportation services
  - Planning, designing, constructing, and renovating facilities and environmental systems



- Providing university master planning
- Managing the University's property interests, with support from Statewide Land Management
- Participate in several university committees, including: Safety Committee; Masterplan Implementation Committee, UAS Incident Response Team, Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Council, and Sustainability Committee.
- 33 full-time staff of which 22 are Local 6070 employees
- Annual operating budget is approximately \$6 million in FY17

### **Facilities Services Administration**

- ▶ Director of Facilities Services: W. Keith Gerken
- ▶ 2 administrative staff, 1 part-time landscape manager
- ▶ Provides department fiscal and strategic management and support
- ▶ Manages all Juneau campus utilities budgets
- ▶ Manages all Juneau campus auxiliary maintenance and renewal budgets (Housing and Recreation Center recharge)
- ▶ Manages shuttle services
- ▶ Manages internal campus mail distribution

### **Facilities Maintenance & Operations**

- ▶ Operations Manager: Joe Mueller
- ▶ 1 custodial supervisor and 18 Local 6070 positions + seasonal hires
- ▶ Responsible for the day-to-day maintenance and operations of the Juneau campus
- ▶ Sitka and Ketchikan campus each have two Local 6070 maintenance positions supervised by the Campus Directors.

### **Facilities Planning & Construction**

- ▶ 3 project managers report directly to the Director of Facilities Services
- ▶ Manages the planning, development, and execution of capital, deferred maintenance and renewal projects for the three UAS campuses
- ▶ Maintains UAS's space and facilities data

### **Environmental, Health, Safety, and Emergency Management**

- ▶ 2 professional staff
- ▶ Ensures UAS activities are conducted in a safe manner.
- ▶ Activities include: safety assessments and trainings, chemical hygiene and waste disposal, emergency management planning, and certificates of insurance.

### **What UAS currently outsources:**

- ▶ All Utilities, shuttle services, internal mail delivery, some custodial, fire systems detection and sprinkler inspections and maintenance, elevator maintenance, some building automation systems support, augmentation of maintenance and operations activities (i.e., work outside of our available time and/or expertise), A/E services, new construction services, most renovation or heavy maintenance, special inspections, hazardous material inspection and remediation, other miscellaneous needs.

### **Statewide**

Statewide mission:

The Statewide Facilities Office provides expertise, leadership, and oversight in planning, programming, budgeting and implementing the University's capital plan. The office promotes collaborative efforts between the three universities and the community campuses, and university leadership. This mission serves as a means to provide and maintain facilities that will ensure an effective, quality education and research environment for students, faculty, staff, and the public. This office, which is under the umbrella of the Strategy, Planning and Budget Office monitors capital projects, coordinates master planning and development, oversees the UA capital plan and conducts project reviews prior to submission to the President or Board of Regents' for approval.

### **Statewide Administration**

CFAO position currently vacant; Interim Michelle Rizk, Chief Strategy, Planning and Budget

- ▶ Tim L. Nelson, Facilities Planning Manager