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.
- **FACILITIES BENCHMARKING & ANALYSIS**: Take control of your facilities and make the case for change without the guesswork.
- **SUSTAINABILITY SOLUTIONS**: Measure and improve environmental stewardship.
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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**
### Facilities Peer Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities Peer Institutions</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine at Fort Kent</td>
<td>Fort Kent, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine at Farmington</td>
<td>Farmington, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine at Machias</td>
<td>Machias, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine at Presque Isle</td>
<td>Presque Isle, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippery Rock University of PA</td>
<td>Slippery Rock, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield University of PA</td>
<td>Mansfield, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockhaven University of PA</td>
<td>Lock Haven, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine at Augusta</td>
<td>Augusta, ME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### University of Alaska – Southeast Peer Institutions

Return on Physical Assets (ROPA+) includes all space at UAS totaling 556,487 GSF

### Comparative Considerations

Size, technical complexity, region, geographic location, and setting are all factors included in the selection of peer institutions.
UAS’s Technical Complexity is On-Par With Peers

Institutions arranged by Technical Complexity

Areas Impacted by Tech Rating

- Energy Consumption
- Maintenance Staffing
- Replacement Values
- Stewardship Targets
- Operational Demand

Tech Rating Distribution

Sightlines Database
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UAS’ Campus has Grown Similar to Peers in GSF

However, total enrollment has decreased by 48%, while peers saw a 36% decrease.
UAS has a Lower Density Campus than Peers

Density factor measures the busyness of campus

Change in *Density at UAS

*Density Factor

Areas Impacted by Density Factor
- Wear and Tear on Space
- Custodial Operations
- Energy Demand

*Density is calculated using On-Campus Student FTEs, Faculty FTE, and Staff FTE

Institutions arranged by Density Factor
UAS Steps to Reach Target

UAS can add FTE’s, decrease usable square footage, or both to reach target

Total on Campus FTE’s by Density GSF

Scenarios to Reach 250 KPI Target:
1. Decrease total GSF by 240,000
2. Increase total FTE’s by 600 (no space changes)
3. Use a targeted approach to decrease GSF, which includes:
   - Demolish the NSRL - 17,591 GSF
   - Demolish Mattocks House - 1,200 GSF
   - Sell and/or recategorize Mathisen House GSF - 1,604.00
     • Should Mathisen be included in Density calculations?
   - Adjust Density GSF at Donald Sperl Joint Use to 28,626 (50%)
     • What portion of building is not usable by UAS?
   - Demolish an older residence hall building?
     • Banfield Hall, is 17,748 GSF, oldest residence building

Total GSF removed from Density – 65,165
• Still requires adding 300 FTE’s

• Are there other buildings that are underutilized, which could have increased utilization allowing for more demolition of space?

*Density is calculated using On-Campus Student FTEs, Faculty FTE, and Staff FTE
Building and Grounds Intensity

UAS’ smaller buildings and compact grounds space produces challenges in efficiency for staff.
UAS Carries a Significantly Younger Campus Age

UAS has started renovating buildings which offsets aging

![Graph showing construction versus renovation age. The graph indicates that UAS's renovation age is 9 years less than Peers.](image)
Ketchikan & Juneau are Younger through Renovations

These two campuses have firmly reduced their age through full building renovations

![Campus Age by Category](image)

- **Juneau**
- **Ketchikan**
- **Sitka**
- **Peers**

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

Lower risk affords the opportunity to plan ahead for future needs.

UAS Has More Low Risk Space Than Peers

Campus Renovation Age by Category

- **High Risk**
  - 44% (UAS)
  - 28% (Peer Average)

- **Medium Risk**
  - 35% (UAS)
  - 18% (Peer Average)

- **Low Risk**
  - 16% (UAS)
  - 20% (Peer Average)

Operational Demands:
- **React as Needed:** Issues in components past the end of their lifecycles will demand reactive maintenance.
- **Focus on PM:** Significant need for PM in young systems.

Capital Risk:
- **Highest Risk:** Life cycles of major components past due – end of building life cycle approaching.
- **Medium Risk:** Lower cost space renewal updates needed.
- **Low Risk:** "Honeymoon" period – little need for capital reinvestment.
Understanding Campus Age

Renovations at Ketchikan make systems younger

Campus Age by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Construction Age</th>
<th>Renovation Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juneau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketchikan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Juneau**
  - Construction Age: 74%
  - Renovation Age: 9%

- **Ketchikan**
  - Construction Age: 53%
  - Renovation Age: 53%

- **Sitka**
  - Construction Age: 72%
  - Renovation Age: 28%
Balance PM and Reactive Maintenance:

Younger components still require PM. Aging components require reactive maintenance.

Operational Demands:

- Under 10 - Low Risk
  - Focus on PM: Significant need for PM in young systems.
- 10 to 25 - Medium Risk
  - Medium Risk: Lower cost space renewal updates needed.
- 25 to 50 - Higher Risk
  - Higher Risk: Life Cycles coming due in core building components.
- Over 50 - Highest Risk

Capital Risk:

- Under 10 - Low Risk
  - "Honeymoon" period – little need for capital reinvestment.
- 10 to 25 - Medium Risk
  - "Honeymoon" period – little need for capital reinvestment.
- 25 to 50 - Higher Risk
  - Life Cycles coming due in core building components.
- Over 50 - Highest Risk
  - Issues in components past the end of their lifecycles will demand reactive maintenance.

UAS Has Flexibility of Managing a Young Campus

Unless UAS begins to fully renovate space in 5 years 56% of space will be “High Risk”
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>

Wave 1 Needs

Wave 2 Needs
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Capital Profile
Capital Funding Sources

Total Operations and Asset Funding

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

Fund 1
- Operations & Maintenance
- Fund 2-9

Sightlines Terminology
- Projects
- Recurring Project Dollars
- One-Time Project Dollars
- Annual Stewardship
- Asset Reinvestment

Terminology
- Repair & Renew - R&R
- Utilities & Grounds & Custodial
- Operations & Maintenance
- Daily Service & PM
- People
- Expenses
- Utilities
Increased Focus on Existing Space in Recent Years

Existing Space investment decreased in recent years, but has seen high investment.
Defining an Annual Investment Target

Annual Funding Target: $5.2M

FY22 Annual Investment Target

- Replacement Value: $386.3 M
- 3% Replacement Value

3% Replacement Value is one of the standard depreciation models used to determine the expected total dollars needed to be put into assets annually to sustain them.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3% Replacement Value</th>
<th>Life Cycle Need</th>
<th>Annual Investment Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Envelope/Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Space/Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$11.59</td>
<td>$5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since FY18 UAS has increased its backlog, caused by a decrease of investment.
Unlike the combined spending trend, Juneau’s trend begins to decrease after FY17.
Ketchikan Capital Spending Frequently Meets Target

After FY20 spending has decreased and missed capital targets

Ketchikan Campus’ Total Capital Investment vs. Ketchikan Funding Target

In FY18, Ketchikan spent $3.7 Million into the Maritime Center

 Millions


Annual Stewardship  Asset Reinvestment  Annual Investment Target  Life Cycle Need

Fund 1 Projects: Annual Stewardship
Funds 2-9 Projects: Asset Reinvestment
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Sitka’s Lower Capital Spending Increases Backlog and Risk

Backlog continues to increase with missed capital targets, zero investment in FY22

Sitka Campus’ Total Capital Investment vs. Sitka Funding Target

- **Decreasing Backlog & Risk**: In FY13 $1.6 Million went into Campus Completion
- **Maintaining Backlog & Risk**: 
- **Increasing Backlog & Risk**: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Stewardship</th>
<th>Asset Reinvestment</th>
<th>Annual Investment Target</th>
<th>Life Cycle Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund 1 Projects**: Annual Stewardship
Funds 2-9 Projects: Asset Reinvestment
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UAS Spends Higher to Target than Peers

Asset reinvestment, or one-time, sources of funding close the gap to reach capital targets.
Disparity In Reaching Targets Across Campuses

Large infusions of capital inflate average spend to target

Total Capital Investment as a Percent of Funding Target

Juneau Campus  Ketchikan Campus  Sitka Campus

Capital Spending % of Total Target

- Annual Stewardship
- Asset Reinvestment
- Average

Fund 1 Projects: Annual Stewardship
Funds 2-9 Projects: Asset Reinvestment
Total Need is Greater than Peers
Total need based on FY22 Facilities Condition Assessment

Deferred Maintenance/capital need saw a dramatic increase in FY22 due to unprecedented 16% inflation

Total Asset Reinvestment Need $/GSF
Regionally Adjusted

University of Alaska – Southeast

Peer Institutions
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Conditions based investment strategy

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

Campus leadership can use FCI categories for different buildings and portfolios, helping to balance capital investments across campus and prioritize project selection.

- **Good Condition**: Primarily new or recently renovated buildings with sporadic building repair & life cycle needs; “You pick the projects”
- **Fair Condition**: Buildings are beginning to show their age and may require more significant investment on a case-by-case basis
- **Poor Condition**: Buildings may require more significant repairs; large-scale capital infusions/renovations are inevitable; “The projects pick you”
- **Critical Condition**: Major building components are in jeopardy of complete failure.
Facilities Condition Index

FCI by Building

Anderson Building
Egan Library/Classroom Addition
Facilities Annex (Previously 11440 Glacier Hwy Residence)
Hendrickson Annex
Mattissen House
Noyes Pavilion
Soboleff Building
Student Housing Unit B
Student Housing Unit C
Student Housing Unit D
Student Housing Unit E
Student Housing Unit F
Student Housing Unit G
Technical Education Center
Water Booster Pump
Whitehead Building
Charles Gamble Jr. - Donald Sperl Joint Use Facility
John R. Pugh (Freshman Student) Residence Hall
Technical Education Center
Natural Sciences Research Lab
Egan, William Library
Mourant Building
Student Housing Unit A
Hendrickson Building
Novatney Building
Student Lodge
Banfield Hall-Residence Hall
Marine Technology Bldg
Knode House
Mattocks House

Good Condition
Fair Condition
Critical Condition
KPI Impact - Analyzing Age and Building Condition

Identifying costly buildings can help focus future capital investment

FCI by FY22 Renovation Age

- **High FCI, Young Age**
  - INVESTIGATE THESE
- **High FCI, Older Age**
  - TARGET THESE
- **Low FCI, Young Age**
  - MAINTAIN/DEFER THESE
- **Low FCI, Older Age**
  - Examine Ten-Year Need

UAS Age KPI: 25 years

UAS FCI KPI: 0.15

Identifying costly buildings can help focus future capital investment.
Identifying older, high need buildings, can help shape investment strategy

**FCI by FY22 Renovation Age**

- **UAS Age KPI:** 25 Years
- **UAS Target FCI:** 0.15

Facilities Condition Index

- Good Condition
- Fair Condition
- Critical Condition
Operations Success
Capital Funding Sources

Total Operations and Asset Funding

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

Sightlines Terminology
- Operations & Maintenance
  - People
  - Expenses
  - Utilities
  - Daily Service & PM
  - Utilities

Projects
- Recurring Project Dollars
- Annual Stewardship
- One-Time Project Dollars
- Asset Reinvestment
Facilities Operating Expenditures vs. Peers

UAS has reduced its Daily Service expenditures in recent years below peer average

Facilities Operating Actuals
Regionally Adjusted

$0
$2
$4
$6
$8
$10
$12

$/GSF


University of Alaska - Southeast
Peer Institutions

PM
Utilities
Avg.

Daily Service
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Budget Cuts Limit Purchasing Power

2022 difference amounts to $2.7M less buying power than 2006 budget

Facilities Operating Actuals

2022 increase to inflation line due to unprecedented 16% increase in construction material prices
Juneau’s Decreasing Budget Follows University Trend

2022 difference amounts to $2M less buying power than 2006 budget

Facilities Operating Actuals

2022 increase to inflation line due to unprecedented 16% increase in construction material prices
Ketchikan Budget Emphasizes PM in Recent Years

Investments into PM will extend building lifecycles and decrease capital need

Facilities Operating Actuals

- **2022 increase to inflation line due to unprecedented 16% increase in construction material prices**
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Sitka’s operational spending is 50% less than 2006 actuals when accounting for inflation.

Facilities Operating Actuals

2022 increase to inflation line due to unprecedented 16% increase in construction material prices.
Facilities Operating Expenditures vs. Peers

UAS has decreased its daily service expenditures, while Peer spending has increased.
UAS Allocates More Resources to PM than Peers

Recent increases in PM spending result in UAS approaching “Best Practice Range”
Utility Operating Expenditures Compared to Peers

UAS utility expenditures remain aligned with peers

UAS versus Peer Utility $ per GSF
Regionally Adjusted

University of Alaska - Southeast

Peer Institutions

$2.24

$2.25
Total Energy Consumption

UAS has seen consumption increase since FY19, but it is still well below peers.

Total Energy Consumption vs. Peers

University of Alaska – Southeast

Peer Institutions

BTU/GSF
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When normalizing by degree day, UAS’ energy consumption is like peers.

Total Energy Consumption vs. Peers
Normalized by Degree Days

University of Alaska – Southeast

Peer Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Energy Consumption</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>10.66 BTU/GSF/DD</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Energy Consumption

Average
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Energy Expenses Fluctuate in Consistent Manner

UAS’ total energy costs continues to be below peer average

Total Energy Cost vs. Peers
Regionally Adjusted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fossil</th>
<th>Electric</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$47.43  $54.35
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Differences in Unit Costs are Growing vs. Peers

Unit costs increased, driving total energy costs higher

**Fossil Fuel Unit Cost**
*Regionally Adjusted*

**Electric Unit Cost**
*Regionally Adjusted*
Maintenance Staffing Coverage

Coverage ratios decreased from FY21, due slight increases in FTE’s
UAS has fewer maintenance supervisors, but more staff and material spend.

Maintenance Metrics

- **Maintenance Staffing**
  - Regionally Adjusted

- **Maintenance Materials**
  - $/GSF

- **Maintenance Supervision**
  - FTE/Super

- **General Repair/Impression**
  - Peers

Institutions arranged by Technical Complexity
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Custodial Staffing Coverage

Custodial staff coverage has returned to FY18 levels
UAS has more custodial supervisors, but less custodial staff, less material spend

**Custodial Staffing**

- A: 40,000
- UAS: 50,000
- B: 30,000
- C: 20,000
- D: 10,000
- E: 0
- F: 0
- G: 0
- H: 0

**Custodial Supervision**

- A: 20
- UAS: 40
- B: 30
- C: 20
- D: 10
- E: 0
- F: 0
- G: 0
- H: 0

**Custodial Materials**

- A: $0.05
- UAS: $0.20
- B: $0.15
- C: $0.10
- D: $0.05
- E: $0.00
- F: $0.00
- G: $0.00
- H: $0.00

**Cleanliness**

- Peers: 3.0
- UAS: 4.2

Institutions arranged by Density Rating
Grounds Staffing Coverage

Grounds staffing fluctuates with loss or gain of temporary employees
UAS has the highest grounds intensity, which correlates with lower rates of coverage.
Questions & Discussion