

# Executive Summary Capital Construction Budget Recommendations and Prioritization 2003-05 Biennium for Postsecondary Education



The *Capital Construction Budget Recommendations and Prioritization 2003-2005 Biennium* provides priority and funding recommendations for capital construction budget requests at the Nebraska State Colleges, the University of Nebraska and the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture at Curtis.

The Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education has identified building maintenance and facility renovation as areas needing attention for the coming biennium. Please refer to Section I for further information regarding the following three funding areas involved with building maintenance and facility renovation.

- **Routine Day-to-Day Maintenance** - This work involves preventive maintenance, minor repairs and routine inspections that reduce wear and extend the life of state-supported facilities. The institution's annual operating budgets for routine day-to-day building maintenance are only about half of nationally recommended standards. The Commission and institutions are presently exploring options to address this need.
- **Deferred Repair** - The Task Force for Building Renewal is able to allocate only 40 percent of the funding necessary for deferred repair based on the low end of nationally recommended standards. The University presently allocates additional funds from its operating budget to address the backlog of deferred repair needs. Together, this funding represent less than the minimum amount of funds needed to address annual deferred repair at our university and state college campuses. The Commission recommends increasing the annual appropriations for the LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal from the present \$9.1 million to \$13 million (equivalent of one dime of cigarette tax).
- **Facilities Renovation** - Thanks to the efforts of the Legislature, Governor and institutions in funding the LB 1100

initiative, recent appropriations for renovations are at the mid-point of nationally recommended standards. The Commission applauds these efforts and supports additional funding as it becomes available to provide modern and functional facilities for our students, faculty and staff.

Of the nine projects requested by institutions, excluding LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal requests, the Commission recommends funding modifications for six projects. Please see Section IV for more detail.

The following eight projects are ranked the highest in the Commission's prioritized list of 17 capital construction requests for the 2003-2005 biennium. This prioritized list includes eight LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal request categories. Please see Section V for a complete list, in priority order, of Commission approved projects.

- #1 **LB 309 Fire and Life Safety - Class I Request for \$11.43 million**
- #2 **LB 309 Deferred Maintenance - Class I Request for \$20.52 million**
- #3 **UNO College of Public Affairs and Community Service Facility Renovation for \$13.5 million**
- #4 (tie) **LB 309 Fire and Life Safety - Class II and III Requests for \$48.76 million (Priorities 1, 2 & 4 totaling \$80.7 million are for postsecondary education only.)**
- #4 (tie) **PSC Emergency Power Generator for \$350,000**
- #4 (tie) **CSC Administration Building Renovation for \$5.28 million**
- #7 **NCTA Education Center - Programming for \$55,000**
- #8 **WSC Maintenance Building Renovation/Addition for \$1.91 million**

# *Section I - Introduction*

## **Statutory Reference**

According to Nebraska Revised Statutes (Reissue 1999), Section 85-1416 (3), “. . . the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska and the Board of Trustees of the Nebraska State Colleges shall each submit to the Commission information the Commission deems necessary regarding each board's capital construction budget requests. The Commission shall review the capital construction budget request information and may recommend to the Governor and the Legislature modification, approval, or disapproval of such requests consistent with the Statewide Facilities Plan and any project approval determined pursuant to subsection (10) of section 85-1414 and section 85-1415. The Commission shall develop from a statewide perspective a unified prioritization of individual capital construction budget requests for which it has recommended approval and submit such prioritization to the Governor and the Legislature for their consideration.”

## **Nebraska's Assets**

A high proportion of the physical assets owned by the state and local governments are found on the campuses of higher education institutions throughout our State. To protect this

considerable investment (\$1.62 billion for state-supported facilities), it is critical that institutions provide proper planning for the construction, efficient use, and maintenance of these facilities. The Commission recognizes the importance of high-quality, well-maintained facilities to support institutional efforts in providing exemplary programs. State government can assist institutions in the following two essential areas of facilities funding: Building Maintenance and Renovation.

## **Financing Building Maintenance and Renovation**

Our state-supported buildings house many functions important to the residents of our state, including public postsecondary education. These buildings represent an enormous investment over the years by the taxpayers of Nebraska. However, these assets deteriorate over time. Weather, use, technology obsolescence, and changes in needs all play a part in this deterioration.

To prevent our buildings from aging further, the Commission is proposing a three step approach to meeting the needs of our existing facilities. The three funding areas involved in this continual process of renewing and adapting existing

## Section I - Introduction

---



facilities are routine day-to-day maintenance, deferred repair and renovation/remodeling.

*Routine Day-to-Day Maintenance:* Funding is needed to provide systematic day-to-day maintenance to prevent or control the rate of deterioration of facilities. This work, funded from annual operating budgets, includes repetitive maintenance such as preventive maintenance, minor repairs and routine inspections. Routine maintenance is similar to changing the oil and providing regular tune-ups in a car on a regular basis. These expenditures reduce wear and extend the life of the facility. Recommended funding for routine maintenance of facilities is between 1% and 1.5% of building replacement values. The University and State Colleges presently fund routine maintenance at about 0.7% of the replacement value of their state-supported facilities. Without adequate routine maintenance, deferred repair and renovation needs grow at a more rapid pace than necessary.

*Deferred Repair:* This work involves major repair and replacement of building systems needed to retain the usability of a facility. Work includes items such as roof replacement, masonry tuck-pointing, window replacement, etc. These items are not normally contained in an annual operating budget. Recommended funding for deferred repair of facilities is between 0.5% and 1% of building replacement values. The

University presently funds deferred repair projects that amount to about 0.2% of the replacement value of their state-supported facilities from its operating budget. The LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal has allocated another \$3.2 million per year in recent years (0.2% of building replacement values) for deferred repairs for State College, University and NCTA state-supported facilities. The Commission is recommending that annual appropriations to the LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal that are available to higher education be increased from the current \$9.1 million per year to \$13 million per year (equivalent of one dime of cigarette tax). About half of these appropriations have historically been used for deferred repair at the State Colleges, University and NCTA. There are several options or combinations of options that could also be considered to provide this funding:

- Increase LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal funding from the present \$9.1 million per year to \$13 million per year to prevent the existing backlog of deferred repair needs from increasing. This funding would provide for continued cyclical deferred repair needs such as roof repair/replacements and other building system repair/replacements. The recently

established two-percent depreciation charge<sup>1</sup> for new renovation projects could then be used to eventually bring down the estimated backlog of \$400 million plus in deferred repair and other building renewal needs.

- Establish a public postsecondary education deferred repair fund financed by an annual square foot fee on state-supported facilities not being charged the two percent depreciation fee. Such a fund could supplement LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal funding until the two-percent depreciation charge is eventually assessed on all public postsecondary educational institutions' state-supported facilities.
- Develop another bond issue to address additional deferred repair projects excluded from the LB 1100 renovation and deferred repair initiative.

One or more of these options could be considered until all state-supported buildings fall under the two-percent depreciation charge that is assessed on buildings as they are renovated.

---

<sup>1</sup>LB 1100 enacted into law in 1998, requires all capital construction projects to be assessed a two-percent depreciation charge for accumulation and use on future deferred repair and renovation/remodeling work. Future allocations from this fund can be used on any state-supported facility at the institution.

*Renovation/Remodeling:* In addition to aging building systems creating the need to renovate a facility, changes in use or programmatic changes can create the need to remodel a building. Renovations will generally include deferred repair work to bring a building fully up to a new and more functional condition. Renovations aid institutions by providing modern, flexible and functional facilities designed to use the latest instructional technologies. Recommended funding for renovation and remodeling is between 0.5% and 1.5% of building replacement values. The State presently is funding renovation and remodeling at an average rate of about 1% of the replacement value of University's and State Colleges' state-supported facilities. This includes annual expenditures from State appropriations and tuition surcharges for the LB 1100 renovation and deferred repair initiative. It is recommended that this level of funding be maintained at an average of 1% of building replacement values or about \$16.2 million per year.

The table on page I-7 provides a summary of the building renewal and adaptation needs for the Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska and Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture. This table outlines recommended funding levels, existing expenditures, and mid-term and long-term goals for routine maintenance, deferred repair and renovation/remodeling.

To fully address these needs, a partnership between the institutions, the Task Force for Building Renewal, and the Executive and Legislative branches of state government is necessary. Each partner has an interest in seeing our institutions' assets adequately maintained and adapted to meet the changing needs of our students, faculty, staff and users of these facilities.

Institutions benefit considerably in providing a well maintained and modern physical plant. Institutions nationally are recognizing the importance of facilities as a recruiting tool in this increasingly competitive atmosphere of retaining and recruiting students. The importance of higher education to our economy is well known. Adequate and well maintained facilities remains an important tool for serving institutional role and missions.

The LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal performs a vital service for our state. It protects our residents and physical investments from harm. The LB 309 Task Force prevents our facilities from deteriorating at a rate faster than normal by making them weather tight. The LB 309 Task Force still has much work to renew our facilities. With additional funding, the LB 309 Task Force could begin to adequately address all of its current responsibilities for fire and life safety, deferred repair, Americans with Disabilities Act, and energy conservation needs.

In 1998, the Legislature passed LB 1100, which was subsequently signed into law by the Governor. This bill provides matching funding for several University of Nebraska and Nebraska State College renovation and deferred repair projects. LB 1100 also created an annual two percent depreciation charge that is assessed on all new or renovated buildings. The depreciation charge is set aside for later use in making deferred repair and renovations to institutional facilities. This action by the Legislature was a major step in finding a permanent solution to deferred repair and renovation needs in the future. While this legislation provides a long-term solution to deferred repair and renovation needs for existing facilities, solutions for deficiencies in routine day-to-day maintenance are still needed. It is important for the State to maintain or increase deferred repair and building renovation/remodeling funding to address the intermediate gap in funding needs until the two percent depreciation charge is eventually assessed on all state-supported facilities.

### **Commission Capital Construction Priorities**

The Commission recommends to the Governor and Legislature a list, in priority order, of approved capital construction projects eligible for State funding. Only those

# Section I - Introduction

---



projects that were approved by the governing boards and the Commission and are requesting State funding in the biennial budget request are considered. The Commission has identified the following statewide facilities priorities for the 2003-2005 biennium:

<i><b>Priority</b></i>	<i><b>Facility Category</b></i>
<i>First</i>	Fire & Life Safety - Class I Requests <sup>2</sup>
<i>Second</i>	Deferred Repair - Class I Requests <sup>2</sup> , or Partially Funded Projects
<i>Third</i>	Americans w/ Disabilities Act - Class I Requests <sup>2</sup> , or Instructional Tech. and Telecommunications
<i>Fourth</i>	Energy Conservation - Class I Requests <sup>2</sup> , or Fire & Life Safety Class II & III Requests <sup>2</sup>
<i>Fifth</i>	Institutional Master Planning/Programming, Renovation/Remodeling/Replacement Projects, or Infrastructure Repair/Replacement Projects
<i>Sixth</i>	Infrastructure Expansion Projects
<i>Seventh</i>	Deferred Repair - Class II & III Requests <sup>2</sup> , New Construction Projects, or Land Acquisition - Meeting Programmatic Needs

<i>Eighth</i>	ADA - Class II & III Requests <sup>2</sup>
<i>Ninth</i>	Energy Conservation - Class II & III Requests <sup>2</sup>
<i>Tenth</i>	Land Acquisition - Future Expansion Needs

Nine additional prioritization criteria are considered in the ranking of individual requests. Section V of this document provides a prioritized list of the Commission's recommended sequencing of approved capital construction requests.

## **Other Previously Approved Projects**

Although funding has not been requested by the governing boards in their capital construction budget requests, the following projects previously approved by the Commission are listed for informational purposes:

- UNK Otto Olsen Renovation Phase 2 - \$7.2 million
- UNL Library Central Storage Facility - \$3.75 million
- UNO Central Utilities Plant Addition - \$3.7 million
- UNO Circulation Road Improvements - \$600,000

---

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix 'A' for definitions of LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal Class I, II and III projects.

**Building Renewal and Adaptation Needs at the  
Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska and Nebraska Col. of Tech. Agriculture**

November 12, 2002



**Annual Expenditures  
for Building  
Maintenance and  
Renov./ Remodeling**

	<b>Building Maintenance Expenditures</b>			
	<b>Routine Maintenance</b>	<b>Deferred Repair</b>	<b>Renovation/ Remodeling</b>	
	<u>Ongoing Funding</u>	<u>One-time Funding</u>	<u>One-time Funding</u>	
	Systematic day-to-day work funded by the annual operating budget to prevent or control deterioration of facilities. Includes repetitive maintenance including preventative maintenance, minor repairs and routine inspections.	Major repair and replacement of building systems needed to retain the usability of a facility. Work includes items such as roof and window replacement, masonry tuck-pointing, etc. These items are not normally contained in the annual operating budget.	Work that is required because of a change in use of the facility or a change in program. Renovation/remodeling work may also include deferred repair items such as roof replacement, masonry tuck-pointing, window replacement, etc.	
<i>Primary Source of Funds</i>	<i>Institutional operating funds (state appropriations and tuition)</i>	<i>Cigarette taxes and University operating funds</i>	<i>State appropriations and tuition surcharges</i>	
<i>Recommended Funding: <sup>1</sup></i>	<i>1% to 1.5% of replacement value<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>0.5% to 1% of replacement value</i>	<i>0.5% to 1.5% of replacement value</i>	<i>2% to 4% of replacement value</i>
<i>Existing Expenditures:</i>	<i>0.7% of replacement value</i>	<i>Univ. - 0.2% of rplcmnt. value    LB 309 - 0.2% of rplcmnt. value</i>	<i>Average 1.05% of replacement value</i>	<i>2.15% of replacement value</i>
<i>10-yr. Mid-term Goal:</i>	<i>1.25% of replacement value</i>	<i>0.5% of replacement value</i>	<i>Average 1% of replacement value</i>	<i>2.75% of replacement value</i>
<i>Long-term Solution:</i>	<i>1.5% of replacement value</i>	<i>2% depreciation charge<sup>3</sup></i>		<i>3.5% of replacement value</i>

<sup>1</sup> Source: Financial Planning Guidelines for Facility Renewal and Adaptation, A joint project of: The Society for College and University Planning (SCUP), The National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), The Association of Physical Plant Administrators of Universities and Colleges (APPA), and Coopers and Lybrand, 1989.

<sup>2</sup> Replacement value for the Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska and Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture state-supported facilities is estimated at \$1.62 billion.

<sup>3</sup> LB 1100 enacted into law in 1998, requires all capital construction projects to be assessed a 2% depreciation charge for accumulation and use for future deferred repair and renovation/remodeling work. Future allocations can be used for all state-supported buildings.



# Section I - Introduction

---



# *Section II - Existing Commitments*

## Section II - Existing Commitments

---



The table on the following page lists three ongoing capital construction project commitments for public postsecondary education. Previous legislative appropriations partially funded these projects and continuation of funds is necessary for successful completion. Funding to continue these projects totals \$28,123,572 for the 2003-2005 biennium, and requires a reaffirmation vote of the Legislature and approval of the Governor before funds can be allocated. The source of funding for the PSC Library/Old Gym Renovations and WSC Power Plant is state appropriations. The source of funding for the State Colleges and University Facilities Fee Projects is state appropriations and student tuition. These projects will address some of the most pressing deferred repair needs at these institutions.

The State has also committed state appropriations to financing several other state agencies capital construction projects including: The York Multi-Custody Facility for Corrections; Network Educational Telecommunications Commission's (NETC) Building Renovation; exterior masonry and structural repairs to the State Capitol; and State Capitol Improvements. The total amount State general fund commitments for non-higher education projects is as follows.

- FY 2003-2004           \$ 6.636 million
- FY 2004-2005           \$ 5.167 million
- Future Biennia           \$35.397 million

Prior legislation has provided for a temporary increase in the amount of cigarette tax funds available for the Building Renewal Task Force. The Task Force currently receives 7 cents of the 64 cent per pack cigarette tax effective October 1, 2002 through September 30, 2004. That amount is scheduled to return to 5 cents on October 1, 2004 after a two-year temporary 20 cent per pack increase expires. This reduction from 7 cents to 5 cents would decrease the Task Force's annual allocations from \$9.1 million to about \$6.5 million per year. As discussed in Section IV, the Commission recommends increasing the amount available for the Building Renewal Task Force to \$13 million per year (equivalent of one dime of cigarette tax) in order to help reduce the backlog of deferred repair needs.

## Capital Construction Reaffirmation Requests 2003-05 Biennium for the Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska & Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture

Institution	Project Title	Leg. Bill No.	Total Project Costs	Prior/Current Approp.		Request Biennium		Future Additional Reaffirmations
				Prior Expenditures	FY 2002-03 Appr./Reappr.	FY 2003-04 Reaffirmation	FY 2004-05 Reaffirmation	
<b>Nebraska State Colleges</b>								
St. Colleges	Systemwide - Facilities Fee Projects	1100	\$11,436,521	\$1,969,539	\$1,352,426	\$1,352,426	\$1,352,426	\$5,409,704
PSC/WSC	PSC Library/Old Gym & WSC Power Plant	1	\$12,642,929	\$0	\$586,769	\$2,009,360	\$2,009,360	\$8,037,440
<i>Subtotal - Nebraska State Colleges</i>			<i>\$24,079,450</i>	<i>\$1,969,539</i>	<i>\$1,939,195</i>	<i>\$3,361,786</i>	<i>\$3,361,786</i>	<i>\$13,447,144</i>
<b>University of Nebraska</b>								
University	Systemwide - Facilities Fee Projects	1100	\$110,000,000	\$32,100,000	\$10,700,000	\$10,700,000	\$10,700,000	\$45,800,000
<i>Subtotal - University of Nebraska</i>			<i>\$110,000,000</i>	<i>\$32,100,000</i>	<i>\$10,700,000</i>	<i>\$10,700,000</i>	<i>\$10,700,000</i>	<i>\$45,800,000</i>
<b>Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture at Curtis</b>								
<i>Subtotal - Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture</i>			<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>
<b>Means of Financing</b>								
State Building Fund (State Income Tax, Sales Tax, etc.)			\$71,642,929	\$17,700,000	\$6,486,769	\$7,909,360	\$7,909,360	\$31,637,440
Nebraska Capital Construction Fund (Cigarette Taxes)			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Cash Funds			\$62,436,521	\$16,369,539	\$6,152,426	\$6,152,426	\$6,152,426	\$27,609,704
Federal Funds			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Private Funds			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total - Nebr. State Colleges / Univ. of Nebraska / NCTA</b>			<b>\$134,079,450</b>	<b>\$34,069,539</b>	<b>\$12,639,195</b>	<b>\$14,061,786</b>	<b>\$14,061,786</b>	<b>\$59,247,144</b>

## Section II - Existing Commitments

---



# *Section III - Governing Board Requests*

## Section III - Governing Board Requests

---



This section identifies the 2003-2005 biennial capital construction budget requests for the LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal (postsecondary education requests only), Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska, and Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture. These tables can be used as a comparison with the Commission's recommendations and priorities that follow in Sections IV and V of this document.

### **LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal Requests**

The LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal 2003-2005 biennium requests for the Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska, and Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture are summarized in the table on the following page. These institutions may have as much as an additional \$100 million in Building Renewal Task Force needs in addition to these requests totaling \$307.6 million. This amount is based on the Commission's estimated deterioration of state-supported facilities at these institutions. These funds would fully "renew" campus facilities using LB 309 Task Force Guidelines.

In the spring of 1993, statutory revisions assigned the LB 309 Task Force with the additional duties of reviewing and allocating funds for fire & life safety and Americans with Disability Act (ADA) projects. These responsibilities added to

the LB 309 Task Force's existing duties involving deferred maintenance and energy conservation.

### **Matching Funds for LB 309 Funding**

The LB 309 Task Force requests agencies to provide some matching funds for individual projects. The LB 309 Task Force's intent is to stretch the limited funds allocated so that more projects may be completed. At the present time, the Nebraska State Colleges are requested to provide 15 percent in matching funds and the University of Nebraska and Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture are requested to provide 20 percent in matching funds.

This policy is effective assuming institutions have excess cash funds available for use as matching funds. If institutional enrollments and/or cash funds are reduced in the future, then use of matching funds becomes increasingly difficult.

Increased funding to the LB 309 Task Force in recent years has also increased the amount of matching funds expended by agencies. The Commission recommends that the Legislature review the percentages of matching funds required for each institution. The existing percentages are particularly difficult to provide for smaller institutions like the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture.

**Combined LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal Requests 2003-2005 Biennium for the  
Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska & Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture**

Project Type	Nebraska State Colleges				University of Nebraska					NCTA	Total - Univ., St. Colleges, & NCTA
	CSC	PSC	WSC	Subtotal	UNK	UNL	UNMC	UNO	Subtotal		
<b>Fire &amp; Life Safety</b>											
Class I	\$106,675	\$143,530	\$575,450	\$825,655	\$220,000	\$7,555,600	\$220,500	\$384,000	\$8,380,100	\$9,600	\$9,215,355
Class II	\$0	\$676,770	\$289,000	\$965,770	\$6,965,600	\$24,950,324	\$93,876	\$1,324,000	\$33,333,800	\$0	\$34,299,570
Class III	\$0	\$0	\$578,000	\$578,000	\$570,400	\$3,532,867	\$0	\$116,000	\$4,219,267	\$0	\$4,797,267
<i>Subtotals</i>	<i>\$106,675</i>	<i>\$820,300</i>	<i>\$1,442,450</i>	<i>\$2,369,425</i>	<i>\$7,756,000</i>	<i>\$36,038,791</i>	<i>\$314,376</i>	<i>\$1,824,000</i>	<i>\$45,933,167</i>	<i>\$9,600</i>	<i>\$48,312,192</i>
<b>Deferred Repair</b>											
Class I	\$316,030	\$1,084,600	\$255,000	\$1,655,630	\$4,505,600	\$4,248,312	\$4,708,100	\$1,266,800	\$14,728,812	\$30,400	\$16,414,842
Class II	\$0	\$241,400	\$0	\$241,400	\$13,061,600	\$20,678,486	\$7,349,445	\$5,442,400	\$46,531,930	\$0	\$46,773,330
Class III	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,765,600	\$71,219,925	\$27,454,811	\$2,407,200	\$102,847,536	\$0	\$102,847,536
<i>Subtotals</i>	<i>\$316,030</i>	<i>\$1,326,000</i>	<i>\$255,000</i>	<i>\$1,897,030</i>	<i>\$19,332,800</i>	<i>\$96,146,722</i>	<i>\$39,512,356</i>	<i>\$9,116,400</i>	<i>\$164,108,278</i>	<i>\$30,400</i>	<i>\$166,035,708</i>
<b>Americans with Disabilities Act</b>											
Class I	\$40,375	\$0	\$293,250	\$333,625	\$816,000	\$333,030	\$1,918,010	\$268,000	\$3,335,040	\$0	\$3,668,665
Class II	\$0	\$195,500	\$51,000	\$246,500	\$88,800	\$3,215,287	\$0	\$0	\$3,304,087	\$0	\$3,550,587
Class III	\$0	\$0	\$1,181,500	\$1,181,500	\$184,000	\$4,532,524	\$0	\$0	\$4,716,524	\$0	\$5,898,024
<i>Subtotals</i>	<i>\$40,375</i>	<i>\$195,500</i>	<i>\$1,525,750</i>	<i>\$1,761,625</i>	<i>\$1,088,800</i>	<i>\$8,080,842</i>	<i>\$1,918,010</i>	<i>\$268,000</i>	<i>\$11,355,652</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$13,117,277</i>
<b>Energy Conservation</b>											
Class I	\$376,550	\$488,750	\$63,750	\$929,050	\$53,600	\$0	\$0	\$277,600	\$331,200	\$33,600	\$1,293,850
Class II	\$0	\$310,250	\$0	\$310,250	\$16,211,200	\$0	\$0	\$138,400	\$16,349,600	\$0	\$16,659,850
Class III	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$80,800	\$0	\$0	\$988,000	\$1,068,800	\$0	\$1,068,800
<i>Subtotals</i>	<i>\$376,550</i>	<i>\$799,000</i>	<i>\$63,750</i>	<i>\$1,239,300</i>	<i>\$16,345,600</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$1,404,000</i>	<i>\$17,749,600</i>	<i>\$33,600</i>	<i>\$19,022,500</i>
<b>Total Task Force for Building Renewal Requests</b>											
<i>Ttl. Requests</i>	<i>\$839,630</i>	<i>\$3,140,800</i>	<i>\$3,286,950</i>	<i>\$7,267,380</i>	<i>\$44,523,200</i>	<i>\$140,266,355</i>	<i>\$41,744,742</i>	<i>\$12,612,400</i>	<i>\$239,146,697</i>	<i>\$73,600</i>	<i>\$246,487,677</i>
<i>Matching \$</i>	<i>\$148,170</i>	<i>\$554,259</i>	<i>\$580,050</i>	<i>\$1,282,479</i>	<i>\$11,130,800</i>	<i>\$35,066,589</i>	<i>\$10,458,685</i>	<i>\$3,153,100</i>	<i>\$59,809,174</i>	<i>\$18,400</i>	<i>\$61,110,053</i>
<i>Ttl. Project \$</i>	<i>\$987,800</i>	<i>\$3,695,059</i>	<i>\$3,867,000</i>	<i>\$8,549,859</i>	<i>\$55,654,000</i>	<i>\$175,332,944</i>	<i>\$52,203,427</i>	<i>\$15,765,500</i>	<i>\$298,955,871</i>	<i>\$92,000</i>	<i>\$307,597,730</i>
	<i>0.3%</i>	<i>1.2%</i>	<i>1.3%</i>	<i>2.8%</i>	<i>18.1%</i>	<i>57.0%</i>	<i>17.0%</i>	<i>5.1%</i>	<i>97.2%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>



## Section III - Governing Board Requests

---



### **Nebraska State Colleges**

The table on the following page provides the Nebraska State Colleges' Capital Construction Budget Request 2003-2005 Biennium in the priority order recommended by the Nebraska State Colleges Board of Trustees. The list includes the Nebraska State Colleges' Building Renewal Task Force requests and priorities.

# Section III - Governing Board Requests



## Capital Construction Request Summary for the Nebraska State Colleges 2003-2005 Biennium

<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>Governing Bd. Priority</b>	<b>Total Request</b>	<b>Prior Expenditure</b>	<b>FY 2002-03 App/Reap</b>	<b>FY 2003-04 Request</b>	<b>FY 2004-05 Request</b>	<b>Additional Request</b>
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY - CLASS I	01	\$971,359	\$0	\$0	\$971,359	\$0	\$0
DEFERRED REPAIR - CLASS I	02	\$1,942,800	\$0	\$0	\$1,942,800	\$0	\$0
ADA - CLASS I	03	\$397,500	\$0	\$0	\$397,500	\$0	\$0
CSC - ADMINISTRATION BUILDING RENOVATION	04	\$5,382,972	\$98,972	\$0	\$5,284,000	\$0	\$0
WSC - MAINTENANCE RENOVATION & ADDITION	05	\$1,914,120	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$914,120	\$0
PSC - EMERGENCY POWER GENERATOR	06	\$350,000	\$0	\$0	\$350,000	\$0	\$0
WSC - CARHART SCIENCE RENOVATION PLANNING	07	\$385,000	\$0	\$0	\$60,000	\$325,000	\$0
CSC - ARMSTRONG RENOVATION PROGRAMMING	08	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$0
PSC - AL WHEELER CENTER BLEACHER RPLCMNT.	09	\$257,000	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$157,000	\$0
WSC - PAVING PROJECT	10	\$975,000	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	\$925,000	\$0
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY - CLASS II	11	\$1,136,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,136,200	\$0
DEFERRED REPAIR - CLASS II	12	\$284,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$284,000	\$0
ADA - CLASS II	13	\$290,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$290,000	\$0
ENERGY CONSERVATION - CLASS I	14	\$1,093,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,093,000	\$0	\$0
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY - CLASS III	15	\$680,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$680,000
DEFERRED REPAIR - CLASS III	16	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
ADA - CLASS III	17	\$1,390,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,390,000
ENERGY CONSERVATION - CLASS II	18	\$365,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$365,000	\$0
ENERGY CONSERVATION - CLASS III	19	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$17,828,951</b>	<b>\$198,972</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$11,163,659</b>	<b>\$4,396,320</b>	<b>\$2,070,000</b>
<b>FUND SOURCE</b>		<b>Total Request</b>	<b>Prior Expenditure</b>	<b>FY 2002-03 App/Reap</b>	<b>FY 2003-04 Request</b>	<b>FY 2004-05 Request</b>	<b>Additional Request</b>
GENERAL FUND		\$16,446,472	\$98,972	\$0	\$10,502,960	\$4,085,040	\$1,759,500
CASH FUND		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FEDERAL FUND		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
REVOLVING FUND		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OTHER FUND		\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$16,546,472</b>	<b>\$198,972</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$10,502,960</b>	<b>\$4,085,040</b>	<b>\$1,759,500</b>
REVENUE BONDS		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LB309 COOPERATIVE FUND		\$1,282,479	\$0	\$0	\$660,699	\$311,280	\$310,500
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,282,479</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$660,699</b>	<b>\$311,280</b>	<b>\$310,500</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$17,828,951</b>	<b>\$198,972</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$11,163,659</b>	<b>\$4,396,320</b>	<b>\$2,070,000</b>

## Section III - Governing Board Requests

---



### **University of Nebraska**

The table on the following page provides the University of Nebraska's Capital Construction Budget Request 2003-2005 Biennium in the priority order recommended by the University of Nebraska Board of Regents. The list includes the University of Nebraska's Building Renewal Task Force requests and priorities.

# Section III - Governing Board Requests



## Capital Construction Request Summary for the University of Nebraska 2003-2005 Biennium

<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>Governing Bd. Priority</b>	<b>Total Request</b>	<b>Prior Expenditure</b>	<b>FY 2002-03 App/Reap</b>	<b>FY 2003-04 Request</b>	<b>FY 2004-05 Request</b>	<b>Additional Request</b>
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY - CLASS I	01	\$10,444,500	\$0	\$0	\$10,444,500	\$0	\$0
UNO - CPACS - ENGINEERING BLDG. RENOV.	02	\$13,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$500,000	\$13,000,000	\$0
ADA - CLASS I	03	\$4,100,050	\$0	\$0	\$4,100,050	\$0	\$0
DEFERRED REPAIR - CLASS I	04	\$18,532,890	\$0	\$0	\$18,532,890	\$0	\$0
ENERGY CONSERVATION - CLASS I	05	\$414,000	\$0	\$0	\$414,000	\$0	\$0
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY - CLASS II	06	\$41,667,250	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$41,667,250	\$0
ADA - CLASS II	07	\$4,130,109	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,130,109	\$0
DEFERRED REPAIR - CLASS II	08	\$58,164,913	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$58,164,913	\$0
ENERGY CONSERVATION - CLASS II	09	\$20,437,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,437,000	\$0
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY - CLASS III	10	\$5,274,084	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,274,084
ADA - CLASS III	11	\$5,895,655	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,895,655
DEFERRED REPAIR - CLASS III	12	\$128,559,420	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$128,559,420
ENERGY CONSERVATION - CLASS III	13	\$1,336,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,336,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$312,455,871</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$33,991,440</b>	<b>\$137,399,272</b>	<b>\$141,065,159</b>

  

<b>FUND SOURCE</b>	<b>Total Request</b>	<b>Prior Expenditure</b>	<b>FY 2002-03 App/Reap</b>	<b>FY 2003-04 Request</b>	<b>FY 2004-05 Request</b>	<b>Additional Request</b>
GENERAL FUND	\$252,646,697	\$0	\$0	\$27,275,153	\$112,519,417	\$112,852,127
CASH FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FEDERAL FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
REVOLVING FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OTHER FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$252,646,697</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$27,275,153</b>	<b>\$112,519,417</b>	<b>\$112,852,127</b>
REVENUE BONDS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LB309 COOPERATIVE FUND	\$59,809,174	\$0	\$0	\$6,716,287	\$24,879,855	\$28,213,032
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$59,809,174</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$6,716,287</b>	<b>\$24,879,855</b>	<b>\$28,213,032</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$312,455,871</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$33,991,440</b>	<b>\$137,399,272</b>	<b>\$141,065,159</b>

## Section III - Governing Board Requests

---



### **Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture**

The table on the following page provides the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture's (NCTA) Capital Construction Budget Request 2003-2005 Biennium in the priority order recommended by the University of Nebraska Board of Regents. The list includes NCTA's Building Renewal Task Force requests and priorities.

# Section III - Governing Board Requests



## Capital Construction Request Summary for the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture at Curtis 2003-2005 Biennium

<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>Governing Bd. Priority</b>	<b>Total Request</b>	<b>Prior Expenditure</b>	<b>FY 2002-03 App/Reap</b>	<b>FY 2003-04 Request</b>	<b>FY 2004-05 Request</b>	<b>Additional Request</b>
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY - CLASS I	01	\$12,000	\$0	\$0	\$12,000	\$0	\$0
NCTA - EDUCATION CENTER - PLANNING	02	\$55,000	\$0	\$0	\$55,000	\$0	\$0
DEFERRED REPAIR - CLASS I.	03	\$38,000	\$0	\$0	\$38,000	\$0	\$0
ENERGY CONSERVATION - CLASS I	04	\$42,000	\$0	\$0	\$42,000	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$147,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$147,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

  

<b>FUND SOURCE</b>	<b>Total Request</b>	<b>Prior Expenditure</b>	<b>FY 2002-03 App/Reap</b>	<b>FY 2003-04 Request</b>	<b>FY 2004-05 Request</b>	<b>Additional Request</b>
GENERAL FUND	\$128,600	\$0	\$0	\$128,600	\$0	\$0
CASH FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FEDERAL FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
REVOLVING FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OTHER FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$128,600</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$128,600</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
REVENUE BONDS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LB309 COOPERATIVE FUND	\$18,400	\$0	\$0	\$18,400	\$0	\$0
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$18,400</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$18,400</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$147,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$147,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## Section III - Governing Board Requests

---



*Section IV - Commission's  
Statewide Capital Construction  
Budget Recommendations*



## Section IV - Commission Recommendations

---



The table on the following page lists all Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska and Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture (NCTA) capital construction requests. The table identifies the Commission's funding recommendations for each project. Projects are shown in alphabetical order. A prioritized list of recommendations for funding Commission approved projects is provided in Section V of these recommendations.

Before state tax funds may be expended, Commission review and approval is required of those projects defined as "capital construction projects" by statute. This includes projects that utilize more than \$265,000 in state tax funds for purposes of new construction, additions, remodeling, or acquisition of a capital structure by gift, purchase, lease-purchase, or other means of construction or acquisition.

The Commission is recommending budget modifications to the following seven requests:

- S *LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal Capital Construction Budget Requests:* The Commission recommends that funding available to the Task Force's funding for higher education be increased from \$9.1 million to \$13 million per year (equivalent of one dime of the cigarette tax). These funds would be

available for all State College, University, and NCTA state-supported facilities, in addition to other state agencies' buildings. These funds are needed to prevent further increases to the deferred repair backlog of projects. Other options or combinations of options to address the backlog of deferred repair needs include establishing a public postsecondary education deferred repair fund financed from an annual square foot fee for all state-supported facilities currently not being charged the two-percent depreciation fee, or developing another bond issue to address additional deferred repair needs excluded from the LB 1100 initiative.

- S *CSC Administration Building Renovation:* The Commission recommends modifying the cash flow to account for a more realistic expectation of project expenditures. The first year includes design and construction document funding. The second year includes construction and equipment funding.
- S *CSC Armstrong Replacement Programming, PSC Wheeler Activity Center Bleacher Replacement, WSC Carhart Science Renovation/Addition Planning, and WSC Paving Project:* The Commission is aware of the revenue shortfall facing the State and the many difficult decisions facing the Governor and

# Capital Construction Budget Recommendations 2003-2005 Biennium for the Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska & Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture



Institution	Project Title	Recommended Project Cost	Prior Expend./ Approp./Reaffir.	Request Biennium		Future Consideration	Status/ Commission Action
				FY 2003-04	FY 2004-05		
<b>Reaffirmation of Partially Funded Projects</b>							
St. Colleges	Systemwide - Facilities Fee Projects	\$11,436,521	\$3,321,965	\$1,352,426	\$1,352,426	\$5,409,704	Approved 7 Projects
PSC/WSC	PSC Library/Old Gym & WSC Power Plant	\$12,642,929	\$586,769	\$2,009,360	\$2,009,360	\$8,037,440	Approved
University	Systemwide - Facilities Fee Projects	\$110,000,000	\$42,800,000	\$10,700,000	\$10,700,000	\$45,800,000	Approved 12 of 13 Projects
<i>Subtotal - Reaffirmations</i>		<i>\$134,079,450</i>	<i>\$46,708,734</i>	<i>\$14,061,786</i>	<i>\$14,061,786</i>	<i>\$59,247,144</i>	
<b>LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal</b>							
St. Col./Univ.	ADA - Class I Requests	\$4,492,550	\$0	\$0	\$449,255	\$4,043,295	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	ADA - Class II and III Requests	\$11,705,764	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,705,764	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Deferred Repair - Class I Requests	\$20,518,690	\$0	\$10,259,345	\$10,259,345	\$0	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Deferred Repair - Class II & III Requests	\$187,008,333	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$187,008,333	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Energy Conservation - Class I Requests	\$1,549,000	\$0	\$0	\$154,900	\$1,394,100	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Energy Conservation - Class II and III Reqsts.	\$22,138,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$22,138,000	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Fire & Life Safety - Class I Requests	\$11,427,859	\$0	\$5,713,930	\$5,713,930	\$0	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Fire & Life Safety - Class II and III Requests	\$48,757,534	\$0	\$0	\$4,875,753	\$43,881,781	Approval Not Required
<i>Subtotal - LB 309 Task Force Requests</i>		<i>\$307,597,730</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$15,973,275</i>	<i>\$21,453,183</i>	<i>\$270,171,273</i>	
<b>Nebraska State Colleges</b>							
CSC	Administration Building Renovation	\$5,382,972	\$98,972	\$500,000	\$4,784,000	\$0	Approved
CSC	Armstrong Renovation Programming	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	Approval Not Required
PSC	Emergency Power Generator	\$350,000	\$0	\$350,000	\$0	\$0	Approval Not Required
PSC	Wheeler Activity Center Bleacher Rplcmnt.	\$257,000	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$157,000	Approval Not Required
WSC	Carhart Science Renov./Addition Planning	\$60,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$60,000	Approval Not Required
WSC	Maintenance Building Renovation/Addition	\$1,914,120	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$914,120	\$0	Approved
WSC	Paving Project	\$975,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$975,000	Approval Not Required
<i>Subtotal - Nebraska State Colleges</i>		<i>\$8,954,092</i>	<i>\$198,972</i>	<i>\$1,850,000</i>	<i>\$5,698,120</i>	<i>\$1,207,000</i>	
<b>University of Nebraska</b>							
UNO	Col of Pub Affairs & Com Serv Facility Renov.	\$13,500,000	\$0	\$500,000	\$6,500,000	\$6,500,000	Approved
<i>Subtotal - University of Nebraska</i>		<i>\$13,500,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$500,000</i>	<i>\$6,500,000</i>	<i>\$6,500,000</i>	
<b>Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture at Curtis</b>							
NCTA	Education Center - Programming	\$55,000	\$0	\$0	\$55,000	\$0	Approval Not Required
<i>Subtotal - Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture</i>		<i>\$55,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$55,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>	
<b>Means of Financing</b>							
State Bldg. Funds/NE Capital Constr. Funds/Cig. Taxes		\$340,539,698	\$24,285,741	\$23,074,459	\$37,383,514	\$255,795,985	
Cash Funds (Includes LB 309 Matching Funds)		\$123,546,574	\$22,521,965	\$9,310,602	\$10,384,575	\$81,329,432	
Private Funds		\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<b>Total - Nebr. State Colleges / Univ. of Nebr. / NCTA</b>		<b>\$464,186,272</b>	<b>\$46,907,706</b>	<b>\$32,385,061</b>	<b>\$47,768,089</b>	<b>\$337,125,417</b>	

Legislature. The Commission recommends delaying funding on these four projects until a future biennium in order to focus on funding reaffirmation requests, LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal Capital Construction Budget Requests, and the remaining institutional capital construction requests that are a higher priority.

- S *WSC Carhart Science Renovation/Addition Planning:* Should funding for design documents be appropriated, the Commission recommends that statutory language be included in any appropriation bill stating that funding beyond the programming phase is contingent on Commission approval of the capital construction project required by the Nebraska Revised Statutes (Reissue 1999), Section 85-1414 (10).
- S *UNO CPACS Facility Renovation:* The Commission recommends modifying the cash flow to account for a more realistic expectation of project expenditures. The first year includes design and construction document funding. The second and third years includes construction and equipment funding.

### **Budget Recommendations**

The capital budget requests prepared by the Nebraska State Colleges' Board of Trustees and University of Nebraska's Board of Regents would primarily renovate or replace antiquated buildings into modern instructional and support facilities. These requests would provide flexible and functional facilities designed to use the latest instructional technologies. These projects would also address deferred repair, ADA and life/safety needs.

Governing board capital construction requests also identify a growing need for funding for the Building Renewal Task Force to address an increasing backlog of fire and life safety, deferred repair, Americans with Disability Act (ADA), and energy conservation needs.

The Commission recommends that as revenues become available, projects be funded in their entirety. Partial funding of capital requests is not recommended, as it does not fully meet the needs of the students, faculty, staff and public that utilize these facilities. Partial funding increases the overall cost of a project by five to ten percent due to additional contractor start-up and shut-down costs. Partial funding also increases inflationary costs as a result of phasing these projects.

## Section IV - Commission Recommendations

---



A brief summary of each capital construction request is included on the following pages that outlines each individual request including the amount requested, a brief project description, Commission approval action, and any recommended funding modifications by the Commission.

### **LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal**

#### **Capital Construction Budget Requests:**

##### **Fire & Life Safety / Deferred Repair / Americans with Disabilities Act / Energy Conservation Requests**

*Budget Request:* \$307,597,730 (higher ed only)

*Project Description:* The request includes Fire & Life Safety, Deferred Repair, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and Energy Conservation requests for the Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska, and Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture.

*Commission Approval:* Approval not required

*Budget Recommendations:* The Commission recommends that appropriations to the Task Force for Building Renewal available for higher education be increased from \$9.1 million to \$13 million per year as previously discussed. Other options or combinations of options to

address the backlog of deferred repair could also be explored.

### **Nebraska State Colleges**

#### **Capital Construction Budget Requests:**

##### **CSC Administration Building Renovation**

*Budget Request:* \$5,284,000

*Project Description:* The project would renovate a facility originally constructed in 1911 that has never undergone a major renovation. The facility houses the Language and Literature, Social Work, Social Sciences, Speech, and Criminal Justice Departments, along with the campus administrative offices. The renovation would provide modern, flexible and functional facilities designed to use the latest instructional technologies. The project would also address deferred repair, ADA and life/safety needs.

*Commission Approval:* Approved on October 5, 1999

*Budget Recommendations:* The Commission recommends modifying the cash flow to account for a more realistic expectation of project expenditures as previously discussed.

## Section IV - Commission Recommendations

---



### **CSC Armstrong Renovation Programming**

*Budget Request:* \$15,000 (Preliminary estimates to complete design and construction are about \$8.7 million.)

*Project Description:* This request would provide funding to develop a program statement to replace the Armstrong Gymnasium. The building, originally constructed in 1964, contains gym, swimming, locker room, office and classroom space.

*Commission Approval:* Approval not required for development of a program statement. Review of planning and construction funding request pending completion of programming.

*Budget Recommendations:* The Commission recommends delaying funding until a future biennium as previously discussed.

### **PSC Emergency Power Generator**

*Budget Request:* \$350,000

*Project Description:* The request would provide funding for an emergency power generator used to keep boilers operational in the event of an extended winter power outage. Enough power could be generated to keep the Campus Service Building and the Al Wheeler Activity Center operational where students could temporarily relocate from the residence halls.

*Commission Approval:* Approval not required

*Budget Recommendations:* No change to institutional request.

### **PSC Wheeler Activity Center Bleacher Replacement**

*Budget Request:* \$157,000

*Project Description:* The project would replace the existing bleachers in the building that are original to the 1980 facility.

*Commission Approval:* Approval not required

*Budget Recommendations:* The Commission recommends delaying funding until a future biennium as previously discussed.

## Section IV - Commission Recommendations

---



### **WSC Carhart Science Renovation/Addition Planning**

*Budget Request:* \$385,000 (Preliminary estimates to complete design and construction are about \$12.5 million.)

*Project Description:* This request would provide funding to develop a program statement for the renovation and addition of the Carhart Science Building, originally constructed in 1969. This request would also provide planning funds through design development for the project. Renovation work would include replacement of the mechanical/HVAC system including fume hoods. The renovation would also replace outdated equipment and finishes and address ADA and functional deficiencies. A proposed addition would provide laboratory and office space and a new elevator.

*Commission Approval:* Approval not required for development of a program statement. Review of planning and construction funding request pending completion of programming.

*Budget Recommendations:* The Commission recommends delaying funding until a future biennium as previously discussed.

### **WSC Maintenance Building Renovation/Addition**

*Budget Request:* \$1,914,120

*Project Description:* The project would provide funding to renovate and construct an addition to the Maintenance Building, originally constructed in 1980. The addition would allow for the relocation of physical plant shop and storage space from the Armory and Stadium Buildings. The Armory Building would then be demolished and the Stadium Building would be used for athletic storage.

*Commission Approval:* Approved November 12, 2002

*Budget Recommendations:* No change to institutional request.

## Section IV - Commission Recommendations

---



### **WSC Paving Project**

*Budget Request:* \$975,000

*Project Description:* This request would replace two existing College-owned streets south of the core of academic buildings on campus. This project would address repair, ADA and safety issues with the existing campus roads. The project would allow for the future closure and conversion of Lewis Drive into a pedestrian mall. Lewis Drive presently dissects the academic core on campus.

*Commission Approval:* Approval not required

*Budget Recommendations:* The Commission recommends delaying funding until a future biennium as previously discussed.

### **University of Nebraska**

### **Capital Construction Budget Request:**

#### **UNO CPACS Facility Renovation**

*Budget Request:* \$13,500,000

*Project Description:* The project would renovate the UNO Engineering Building, originally constructed in 1959, for the College of Public Affairs and Community Service (CPACS), Communications Department and University Radio and Television. CPACS programs would use space vacated by Engineering programs that were relocated to the new Kiewit Institute in 1999. CPACS programs are presently located in several old annexes that would be demolished. The renovation would provide modern, flexible and functional facilities designed to use the latest instructional technologies. The project would also address deferred repair, ADA and life/safety needs.

*Commission Approval:* Approved September 18, 1998

*Budget Recommendations:* The Commission recommends modifying the cash flow to account for a more realistic expectation of project expenditures as previously discussed.

## Section IV - Commission Recommendations

---



### **Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture Capital Construction Budget Request:**

#### **NCTA Education Center - Programming**

*Budget Request:* \$55,000 (Does not include an additional future state funding request to complete design and construction)

*Project Description:* Program statement funding is being requested to begin planning for the replacement of antiquated space on campus and providing additional science lab and auditorium space not presently available. The Agricultural Business program would also be accommodated in a new facility so that a tutorial center could be provided in the vacated space in Agriculture Hall. The Dairy Barn constructed in 1935, and three Horticulture facilities constructed in 1935, 1964 and 1974 respectively would be demolished.

*Commission Approval:* Approval not required for development of a program statement. Review of planning and construction funding request pending completion of programming.

*Budget Recommendations:* No change to institutional request.



## Section IV - Commission Recommendations

---



*Section V - Commission  
Prioritization of Approved Capital  
Construction Requests*

The Commission's priorities for the 2003-2005 biennium are included on the following page. This recommended sequencing of approved capital construction projects combines the separate budget requests from the Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska, and Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture. Only those capital projects that have been previously approved by the governing boards and the Commission and are requesting state funding in the biennial budget request are considered for this prioritized list.

### Methodology

The Commission used ten weighted criteria to evaluate individual project requests in developing a list of statewide priorities. A copy of the Commission's *Prioritization Process to Sequence Appropriations for Approved Capital Construction Projects*, detailing the Commission's methodology, is available on the Commission's website. A hard copy is available upon request. Explanatory comments identifying how points were determined for each capital construction project request are included at the end of this section.

In developing the prioritization process, a primary goal of the Commission was to protect building occupants and prevent further deterioration of the State's existing physical assets.

### Sector Initiatives

The Commission encourages governing boards to target specific areas of their capital budget requests for special consideration as "sector initiatives." These initiatives are considered in the Commission's ranking of individual project requests. The Nebraska State Colleges Board of Trustees and the University of Nebraska Central Administration submitted the following designations as "sector initiatives."

#### *Nebraska State Colleges:*

- Upgrading classroom and library facilities to meet accreditation standards and enhance program quality and access
- Protecting the investment in facilities and grounds at the State Colleges through careful upkeep and responsible, orderly planning

#### *University of Nebraska:*

- College of Public Affairs and Community Service
- Safe, efficient, cost-effective use of existing facilities
- Enhancement of instructional capabilities including renovation of existing buildings to support development of new formats, techniques, physical spaces and instructional technology

# Statewide Capital Priority Recommendations 2003-2005 Biennium for the Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska & Nebr. College of Technical Agriculture



Priority	Institution	Project Title <sup>1</sup>	Funding Amount Recommended	Prioritization Criteria											Total Points	Possible Points	Percent of Points
				Statewide Facilities Category Rank	Sector Initiatives	Inst. Strategic & Long-Range Planning	Immediacy of Need	Addressing Quality of Facility	Avoid Unnecessary Duplication	Appropriate Quantity of Space	Statewide Role & Mission	Building Maintenance Expenditures	Ongoing Costs				
1.	St. Col./Univ.	Fire & Life Safety - Class I Requests	\$11,427,859	30.0	10.0	---	10.0	10.0	10.0	---	4.9	5.0	3.0	82.9	85	98%	
2.	St. Col./Univ.	Deferred Repair - Class I Requests	\$20,518,690	27.0	10.0	---	10.0	9.0	10.0	---	4.4	4.6	3.0	78.0	85	92%	
3.	UNO	Col of Pub Affairs & Com Serv Facility Renov.	\$13,500,000	18.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	5.0	4.6	5.0	3.0	82.6	100	83%	
4.	St. Col./Univ.	Fire & Life Safety - Class II and III Requests	\$48,757,534	21.0	10.0	---	9.0	7.0	10.0	---	4.4	4.7	3.0	69.2	85	81%	
4.	PSC	Emergency Power Generator	\$350,000	21.0	10.0	---	9.0	7.0	10.0	---	4.1	5.0	3.0	69.1	85	81%	
4.	CSC	Administration Building Renovation	\$5,284,000	19.1	10.0	10.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	2.0	80.6	100	81%	
7.	NCTA	Education Center - Programming	\$55,000	18.0	---	10.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	---	5.0	5.0	2.0	67.0	85	79%	
8.	WSC	Maintenance Building Renovation/Addition	\$1,914,120	16.7	7.8	10.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	5.0	2.0	5.0	2.0	75.4	100	75%	
9.	St. Col./Univ.	ADA - Class I Requests	\$4,492,550	24.0	0.0	---	9.0	8.0	10.0	---	4.1	4.7	3.0	62.8	85	74%	
10.	St. Col./Univ.	Energy Conservation - Class I Requests	\$1,549,000	21.0	0.0	---	9.0	7.0	10.0	---	4.5	4.9	5.0	61.4	85	72%	
10.	WSC	Paving Project	\$975,000	17.3	7.5	10.0	7.0	4.0	10.0	---	4.6	5.0	3.0	68.4	95	72%	
12.	WSC	Carhart Science Renov./Addition Planning	\$60,000	15.5	5.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	68.5	100	68%	
13.	CSC	Armstrong Renovation Programming	\$15,000	18.0	0.0	10.0	8.0	4.0	10.0	---	5.0	5.0	3.0	63.0	95	66%	
13.	PSC	Wheeler Activity Center Bleacher Rplcmnt.	\$157,000	12.0	10.0	---	7.0	4.0	10.0	---	5.0	5.0	3.0	56.0	85	66%	
15.	St. Col./Univ.	Deferred Repair - Class II & III Requests	\$187,008,333	12.0	10.0	---	7.0	4.0	10.0	---	4.2	4.9	3.0	55.1	85	65%	
16.	St. Col./Univ.	ADA - Class II and III Requests	\$11,705,764	9.0	0.0	---	6.0	3.0	10.0	---	4.4	5.0	3.0	40.3	85	47%	
17.	St. Col./Univ.	Energy Conservation - Class II and III Reqsts.	\$22,138,000	6.0	0.0	---	6.0	2.0	10.0	---	4.8	3.6	4.0	36.4	85	43%	
<b>Possible Points for each Prioritization Criterion</b>			<b>\$329,907,850</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>		<b>100</b>		

<sup>1</sup> Projects requesting reaffirmation funding or Commission approved projects that are not requesting funds are not included on this prioritized list.

# #1 LB 309 / Fire & Life Safety - Class I Request



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** Not Applicable.  
**Date of Commission Approval:** Not required for this type of project.  
**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p><b>1. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This type of project is ranked first out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	30	30
<p><b>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The State College Board of Trustees designated “protecting the investment in facilities and grounds at the State Colleges through careful upkeep . . .” as a sector initiative. The University has designated “. . . the safe, efficient, cost effective use of existing facilities” as a sector initiative. This request addresses both of these designated sector initiatives.</p>	10	10
<p><b>3. Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p><b>4. The immediacy of the need for the project.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> These projects require immediate action to ensure the safety of occupants and protect our capital investments.</p>	10	10
<p><b>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Fire &amp; Life Safety - Class I requests are awarded the maximum points allowed for this criterion.</p>	10	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities at these institutions.</p>	10	10
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request will provide fire and life safety code compliance to instructional, academic/student support, research, public service and administrative/operational facilities. A weighted average of points awarded for each type of space was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.94	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institutions: CSC, PSC, WSC, UNK, UNL, UNMC, UNO and NCTA. A weighted average of points awarded to each institution was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.96	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> These projects should not increase long-term facility operational and maintenance costs at institutions.</p>	3	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>82.9</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>98%</b>	

## #2 LB 309 / Deferred Repair - Class I Request



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** Not Applicable.  
**Date of Commission Approval:** Not required for this type of project.  
**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. <b>Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This type of project is ranked second out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	27	30
<p>2. <b>Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The State College Board of Trustees designated “protecting the investment in facilities and grounds at the State Colleges through careful upkeep . . .” as a sector initiative. The University has designated “. . . the safe, efficient, cost effective use of existing facilities” as a sector initiative. This request addresses both of these designated sector initiatives.</p>	10	10
<p>3. <b>Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. <b>The immediacy of the need for the project.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> These projects require immediate action to avoid costly damage to buildings and equipment.</p>	10	10
<p>5. <b>The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Deferred Repair - Class I requests are awarded nine points for this criterion.</p>	9	10
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities at these institutions.</p>	10	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request will repair instructional, academic/student support, research, public service and administrative/operational facilities. A weighted average of points awarded for each type of space was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.4	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institutions: CSC, PSC, WSC, UNK, UNL, UNMC, UNO, and NCTA. A weighted average of points awarded to each institution was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.59	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> These projects should not increase long-term facility operational and maintenance costs at institutions.</p>	3	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>78.0</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>92%</b>	



### #3 UNO CPACS Facility Renovation



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** June 20, 1998  
**Date of Commission Approval:** September 18, 1998  
**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p><b>1. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> One percent of this project would include instructional technology/telecommunications space ranked third out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs. The remaining space is primarily a renovation (98 percent) ranked fifth and a small interior addition which is ranked seventh.</p>	17.95	30
<p><b>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The University has designated the College of Public Affairs and Community Service (CPACS) as a sector initiative. CPACS would occupy 56.6 percent of the facility. The University also designated "... the safe, efficient, cost effective use of existing facilities" and "... enhancement of instructional capabilities" as a sector initiatives.</p>	10	10
<p><b>3. Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The UNO Facilities Master Plan accepted by the Board of Regents in August 27, 1999, identifies the need to renovate the existing Engineering Building. The Plan also considers external and internal factors affecting the College and links strategic planning initiatives to the capital plan.</p>	10	10
<p><b>4. The immediacy of the need for the project.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project should be funded in the coming biennium.</p>	9	10
<p><b>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> UNO CPACS facilities are in fair physical condition. This project will address all functional problems with the existing spaces.</p>	8	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities.</p>	10	10
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program's needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> The amount of space identified is adequately justified in the proposal.</p>	5	5
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This proposal affects undergraduate and graduate instructional space, and research space.</p>	4.63	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> UNO has funded routine building maintenance to a reasonable level compared to the percentage of state appropriations and tuition available. Dollars expended per gross square foot of state-supported buildings at UNO are 8 percent above the median of national peers.</p>	5	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not require additional state resources for facility's operations and maintenance.</p>	3	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>82.6</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>83%</b>	

## #4 LB 309 / Fire & Life Safety - Classes II & III Request



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** Not Applicable.  
**Date of Commission Approval:** Not required for this type of project.  
**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. <b>Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This type of project is ranked fourth out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	21	30
<p>2. <b>Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b>  <i>Comments:</i> The State College Board of Trustees designated “protecting the investment in facilities and grounds at the State Colleges through careful upkeep . . .” as a sector initiative. The University has designated “. . . the safe, efficient, cost effective use of existing facilities” as a sector initiative. This request addresses both of these designated sector initiatives.</p>	10	10
<p>3. <b>Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. <b>The immediacy of the need for the project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> These projects are required to comply with building and fire codes to protect the building and its occupants.</p>	9	10
<p>5. <b>The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> Fire &amp; Life Safety - Classes II &amp; III requests are awarded seven points for this criterion.</p>	7	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities at these institutions.</p>	10	10
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request will improve fire and life safety in instructional, academic/student support and administrative/operational facilities. A weighted average of points awarded for each type of space was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.4	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from PSC, WSC, UNK, UNL, UNMC and UNO. A weighted average of points awarded to each institution was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.71	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> These projects should not increase long-term facility operational and maintenance costs at institutions.</p>	3	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>69.1</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>81%</b>	

## #4 PSC / Emergency Power Generator



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** June 11, 2002  
**Date of Commission Approval:** Not required for this type of project.  
**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. <b>Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This type of project is ranked fourth out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	21	30
<p>2. <b>Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b>  <i>Comments:</i> The State College Board of Trustees designated "protecting the investment in facilities and grounds at the State Colleges through careful upkeep . . ." as a sector initiative. This request addresses this designated sector initiative.</p>	10	10
<p>3. <b>Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. <b>The immediacy of the need for the project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This project is required in the coming biennium to protect campus buildings and their occupants.</p>	9	10
<p>5. <b>The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This project is comparable to a Fire &amp; Life Safety - Classes II &amp; III request which are awarded seven points for this criterion.</p>	7	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities.</p>	10	10
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request will improve life safety in academic/academic support and administrative/operational facilities. A weighted average of points awarded for each type of space was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.1	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> PSC has funded routine building maintenance to a reasonable level compared to the percentage of state appropriations and tuition available. Dollars expended per gross square foot of state-supported buildings at PSC are 10 percent above the median of national peers.</p>	5	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not require additional state resources for facility’s operations and maintenance.</p>	3	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>69.1</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>81%</b>	

## #4 CSC Administration Building Renovation



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** May 14, 1999  
**Date of Commission Approval:** October 5, 1999  
**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p><b>1. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Two percent of the project is partially funded which ranks second out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs. Fifteen percent of this project involves instructional technology which is ranked third in overall statewide needs. The remaining 83 percent is renovation which ranks fifth.</p>	19.1	30
<p><b>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The State College Board of Trustees designated “Upgrading classroom and library facilities to meet accreditation standards . . .” and “protecting the investment in facilities and grounds at the State Colleges through careful upkeep . . .” as sector initiatives. This project would address both of these initiatives.</p>	10	10
<p><b>3. Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The CSC Campus Facilities Master Plan approved by the Board of Trustees on November 13, 2001, identified the need to renovate the Administration Building. The Plan identifies external and internal environmental trends, forecasts, and assumptions that affect the project’s programs and services. The Plan also links strategic planning initiatives to the capital plan.</p>	10	10
<p><b>4. The immediacy of the need for the project.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project should be funded in the coming biennium in order to renovate an antiquated facility that lacks modern instructional technologies.</p>	9	10
<p><b>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This building, currently in fair condition, will address all physical and functional deficiencies.</p>	8	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not increase the amount of space on campus.</p>	10	10
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program's needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This renovation does not address an excess capacity of classroom space on campus based on classroom utilization information. CSC utilized existing classrooms on campus an average of 17.5 hours per week in the 1999 fall semester. This does not compare favorably to nationally recognized standards of 30 hours per week for four-year institutions.</p>	3	5
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This proposal affects undergraduate instructional and administrative space.</p>	4.5	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> CSC has funded routine building maintenance to a reasonable level compared to the percentage of state appropriations and tuition available. Dollars expended per gross square foot of state-supported buildings at CSC are 21 percent above the median of national peers.</p>	5	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> The updated program statement indicated an increase in operating and maintenance costs for air-conditioning the Administration Building.</p>	2	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>80.6</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>81%</b>	



## #7 NCTA Education Center Programming



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** June 1, 2002

**Date of Commission Approval:** Not required for development of a program statement.

**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. <b>Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> Programming is ranked fifth out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	18	30
<p>2. <b>Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable to NCTA projects.</p>	0	0
<p>3. <b>Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> The NCTA Facilities Master Plan reviewed by the Board of Regents in July 1996, identifies the need to replace antiquated instructional facilities. The Plan also considers external and internal factors affecting the College, and links strategic planning initiatives to the capital.</p>	10	10
<p>4. <b>The immediacy of the need for the project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request should be funded in the coming biennium.</p>	9	10
<p>5. <b>The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> NCTA Dairy Barn and Horticulture facilities are in fair physical condition. This project should address all functional problems with the existing spaces.</p>	8	10
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities.</p>	10	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This proposal affects undergraduate instructional space.</p>	5	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> NCTA has made a concerted effort to fund routine building maintenance with the resources available. Dollars expended per gross square foot of state-supported buildings at NCTA are 29 percent above the median of national peers.</p>	5	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request will likely require additional state resources for facility's operations and maintenance.</p>	2	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>67.0</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>79%</b>	

## #8 WSC / Maintenance Building Renovation/Addition



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** June 11, 2002  
**Date of Commission Approval:** November 12, 2002  
**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p><b>1. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Renovation/replacement (78 percent of the project) is ranked fifth out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs. The remainder of the project involves a new addition which is ranked seventh in terms of overall statewide need.</p>	16.66	30
<p><b>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The State College Board of Trustees designated “protecting the investment in facilities and grounds at the State Colleges through careful upkeep . . .” as a sector initiative. Funding used for the renovation and replacement portion of this request addresses this designated sector initiative.</p>	7.77	10
<p><b>3. Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The WSC Campus Master Plan approved by the Board of Trustees on April 9, 2002, identified the renovation and addition to the Maintenance Building as a future project. The Plan identifies external and internal environmental trends, forecasts, and assumptions that affect the project’s programs and services. The Plan also links strategic planning initiatives to the capital plan.</p>	10	10
<p><b>4. The immediacy of the need for the project.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project should be funded in the coming biennium.</p>	9	10
<p><b>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> WSC maintenance facilities range from good to poor physical condition. This project will address all functional problems with the existing spaces.</p>	8	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities.</p>	10	10
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program's needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> The amount of space identified is adequately justified in the proposal.</p>	5	5
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request affects operational support space.</p>	2	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> WSC has made a concerted effort to fund routine building maintenance within the resources available. Dollars expended per gross square foot of state-supported buildings at WSC however, are 5 percent below the median of national peers.</p>	5	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request would require additional state resources for facility's operations and maintenance of the addition.</p>	2	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>75.4</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>75%</b>	

## #9 LB 309 / Americans with Disabilities Act - Class I Request



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** Not Applicable.  
**Date of Commission Approval:** Not required for this type of project.  
**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. <b>Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This type of project is ranked third out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	24	30
<p>2. <b>Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not contain a designated sector initiative.</p>	0	10
<p>3. <b>Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. <b>The immediacy of the need for the project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> These projects are considered items that are clearly necessary to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 or have been deemed necessary by physically challenged individuals to gain program access.</p>	9	10
<p>5. <b>The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> Americans with Disabilities Act - Class I requests are awarded eight points for this criterion.</p>	8	10
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities at these institutions.</p>	10	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request will provide accessibility to instructional, academic/student support, research, public service and administrative/operational facilities. A weighted average of points awarded for each type of space was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.1	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institutions: CSC, WSC, UNK, UNL, UNMC and UNO. A weighted average of points awarded to each institution was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.66	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> These projects should not increase long-term facility operational and maintenance costs at institutions.</p>	3	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>62.8</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>74%</b>	

## #10 LB 309 / Energy Conservation - Class I Request



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** Not Applicable.  
**Date of Commission Approval:** Not required for this type of project.  
**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. <b>Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This type of project is ranked fourth out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	21	30
<p>2. <b>Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not contain a designated sector initiative.</p>	0	10
<p>3. <b>Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. <b>The immediacy of the need for the project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> These projects require action during the coming biennium to reduce excessive energy expenditures. Simple payback for these projects range from less than three years to ten years.</p>	9	10
<p>5. <b>The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> Energy Conservation - Class I requests are awarded seven points for this criterion.</p>	7	10
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities at these institutions.</p>	10	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request will improve energy efficiencies in instructional, academic/student support, research, public service and administrative/operational facilities. A weighted average of points awarded for each type of space was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.51	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institutions: CSC, PSC, WSC, UNK and UNO. A weighted average of points awarded to each institution was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.93	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> These projects will provide a financial payback in ten years or less after which the state will see a return on its investment.</p>	5	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>61.4</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>72%</b>	



## #10 WSC Paving Project



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** June 11, 2002  
**Date of Commission Approval:** Not required for this type of project.  
**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p><b>1. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project includes both infrastructure repair/replacement which is ranked fifth out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs and infrastructure expansion of roads on campus which is sixth in overall statewide needs.</p>	17.25	30
<p><b>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The State College Board of Trustees designated "protecting the investment in facilities and grounds at the State Colleges through careful upkeep . . ." as a sector initiative. The repair/replacement portion of this request addresses this designated sector initiative.</p>	7.5	10
<p><b>3. Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The WSC Campus Master Plan approved by the Board of Trustees on April 9, 2002, identified the need to remove and make improvements to the circulation system on campus including this first phase. The Plan identifies external and internal environmental trends, forecasts, and assumptions that affect the project's programs and services. The Plan also links strategic planning initiatives to the capital plan.</p>	10	10
<p><b>4. The immediacy of the need for the project.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project is needed within the next five years to correct problems with existing roads.</p>	7	10
<p><b>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Deferred Repair - Class II and III type requests are awarded four points for this criterion.</p>	4	10

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities</p>	10	10
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request will repair roads used for instructional, academic/student support and administrative/operational support facilities. A weighted average of points awarded for each type of space on campus was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.62	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> WSC has made a concerted effort to fund routine building maintenance within the resources available. Dollars expended per gross square foot of state-supported buildings at WSC however, are 5 percent below the median of national peers.</p>	5	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request should not require additional state resources for facility’s operations and maintenance.</p>	3	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>68.4</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>72%</b>	

## #12 WSC / Carhart Science Renovation & Addition Planning



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** June 11, 2002

**Date of Commission Approval:** Not required for development of a program statement.

**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p><b>1. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Programming is ranked fifth out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs. Planning funds are estimated to be half for renovation which is ranked fifth in terms of overall statewide need, and half for a new addition which is ranked seventh in terms of overall statewide need.</p>	15.46	30
<p><b>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The State College Board of Trustees designated "protecting the investment in facilities and grounds at the State Colleges through careful upkeep . . ." as a sector initiative. Funding used for planning the renovation portion of this request addresses this designated sector initiative.</p>	5	10
<p><b>3. Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The WSC Campus Master Plan approved by the Board of Trustees on April 9, 2002, identified the renovation and addition to the Carhart Science Building as a future project. The Plan identifies external and internal environmental trends, forecasts, and assumptions that affect the project's programs and services. The Plan also links strategic planning initiatives to the capital plan.</p>	10	10
<p><b>4. The immediacy of the need for the project.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project is needed within the next four years to complete a program statement.</p>	8	10
<p><b>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This building, currently in fair condition, will address all physical and functional deficiencies.</p>	8	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> A request for programming funds does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities.</p>	10	10
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program's needs.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The need for additional laboratory space does not appear to be supported by class laboratory utilization information. WSC utilized existing class laboratories in the Carhart Science Building an average of 10.4 hours per week in the 1999 fall semester. This does not compare favorably to nationally recognized standards of 20 hours per week for four-year institutions.</p>	0	5
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This proposal affects undergraduate instructional space.</p>	5	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> WSC has made a concerted effort to fund routine building maintenance within the resources available. Dollars expended per gross square foot of state-supported buildings at WSC however, are 5 percent below the median of national peers.</p>	5	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This request would require additional state resources for facility's operations and maintenance of the addition.</p>	2	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>68.5</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>68%</b>	

## #13 CSC / Armstrong Renovation Programming



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** June 11, 2002

**Date of Commission Approval:** Not required for development of a program statement.

**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. <b>Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Programming is ranked fifth out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	18	30
<p>2. <b>Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This request does not contain a designated sector initiative.</p>	0	10
<p>3. <b>Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The CSC Campus Facilities Master Plan approved by the Board of Trustees on November 13, 2001, identified the need to remove and replace the Armstrong Gym and Natatorium. The Plan identifies external and internal environmental trends, forecasts, and assumptions that affect the project's programs and services. The Plan also links strategic planning initiatives to the capital plan.</p>	10	10
<p>4. <b>The immediacy of the need for the project.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project is needed within the next four years to complete a feasibility study.</p>	8	10
<p>5. <b>The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The existing facility is in fair physical condition. Existing utility services would also be improved by renovating or replacing the existing facility.</p>	4	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities.</p>	10	10
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This proposal affects student support space.</p>	5	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> CSC has funded routine building maintenance to a reasonable level compared to the percentage of state appropriations and tuition available. Dollars expended per gross square foot of state-supported buildings at CSC are 21 percent above the median of national peers.</p>	5	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not require additional state resources for facility’s operations and maintenance..</p>	3	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>63.0</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>66%</b>	

## #13 PSC / AI Wheeler Activity Center Bleacher Replacement



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** June 11, 2002  
**Date of Commission Approval:** Not required for this type of project.  
**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. <b>Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This type of project is ranked seventh out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	12	30
<p>2. <b>Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b>  <i>Comments:</i> The State College Board of Trustees designated "protecting the investment in facilities and grounds at the State Colleges through careful upkeep . . ." as a sector initiative. This request addresses this designated sector initiative.</p>	10	10
<p>3. <b>Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. <b>The immediacy of the need for the project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This project is needed within the next five years to replace bleachers that are at the end of their useful life.</p>	7	10
<p>5. <b>The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This project is similar to a Deferred Repair - Class II and III request which are awarded four points for this criterion.</p>	4	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities.</p>	10	10
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request will make repairs to a student support facility.</p>	5	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> PSC has funded routine building maintenance to a reasonable level compared to the percentage of state appropriations and tuition available. Dollars expended per gross square foot of state-supported buildings at PSC are 10 percent above the median of national peers.</p>	5	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not require additional state resources for facility’s operations and maintenance.</p>	3	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>56.0</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>66%</b>	



## #15 LB 309 / Deferred Repair - Classes II & III Request



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** Not Applicable.  
**Date of Commission Approval:** Not required for this type of project.  
**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. <b>Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This type of project is ranked seventh out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	12	30
<p>2. <b>Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The State College Board of Trustees designated “protecting the investment in facilities and grounds at the State Colleges through careful upkeep . . .” as a sector initiative. The University has designated “. . . the safe, efficient, cost effective use of existing facilities” as a sector initiative. This request addresses both of these designated sector initiatives.</p>	10	10
<p>3. <b>Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. <b>The immediacy of the need for the project.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> These projects are needed to correct problems that if neglected will quickly deteriorate or would partially renew a facility.</p>	7	10
<p>5. <b>The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b></p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Deferred Repair - Class II and III requests are awarded four points for this criterion.</p>	4	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities at these institutions.</p>	10	10
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program's needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request will repair instructional, academic/student support, research, public service and administrative/operational facilities. A weighted average of points awarded for each type of space was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.24	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institutions: PSC, UNK, UNL, UNMC and UNO. A weighted average of points awarded at each institution was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.85	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> These projects should not increase long-term facility operational and maintenance costs at institutions.</p>	3	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>55.1</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>65%</b>	

## #16 LB 309 / Americans with Disabilities Act - Classes II & III Request



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** Not Applicable.  
**Date of Commission Approval:** Not required for this type of project.  
**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. <b>Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This type of project is ranked eighth out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	9	30
<p>2. <b>Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not contain a designated sector initiative.</p>	0	10
<p>3. <b>Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. <b>The immediacy of the need for the project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> These projects are considered items that may be necessary to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.</p>	6	10
<p>5. <b>The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> Americans with Disabilities Act - Class II and III requests are awarded three points for this criterion.</p>	3	10
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities at these institutions.</p>	10	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request will provide additional accessibility to academic/student support, research, public service and administrative/operational facilities. A weighted average of points awarded for each type of space was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.37	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institutions: PSC, WSC, UNK and UNL. A weighted average of points awarded at each institution was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.96	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> These projects should not increase long-term facility operational and maintenance costs at institutions.</p>	3	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>40.3</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>47%</b>	

## #17 LB 309 / Energy Conservation - Classes II & III Request



**Date of Governing Board Approval:** Not Applicable.  
**Date of Commission Approval:** Not required for this type of project.  
**Phasing Considerations:** No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. <b>Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This type of project is ranked ninth out of ten broad categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	6	30
<p>2. <b>Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not contain a designated sector initiative.</p>	0	10
<p>3. <b>Degree that the project complies with long-range planning practices.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. <b>The immediacy of the need for the project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> These projects would reduce energy expenditures. Simple payback for these projects is ten years or longer.</p>	6	10
<p>5. <b>The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> Energy Conservation - Class II and III requests are awarded two points for this criterion.</p>	2	10
<p>6. <b>Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities at these institutions.</p>	10	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>7. <b>The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. <b>Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role &amp; mission priorities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request will improve energy efficiencies in instructional, academic/student support, research, public service and administrative/operational facilities. A weighted average of points awarded for each type of space was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.79	5
<p>9. <b>Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institution: PSC, UNK and UNO. A weighted average of points awarded to each institution was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	3.62	5
<p>10. <b>The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</b>  <i>Comments:</i> These projects will provide some financial payback and are therefore awarded points accordingly.</p>	4	5
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>36.4</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</b>	<b>43%</b>	

## Section V - Commission Prioritization

---



# *Appendix A - Definitions*



## **Task Force for Building Renewal Requests**

The Task Force for Building Renewal is a division of the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) with oversight provided by the Legislature's Committee on Building Maintenance. The Task Force is responsible for Deferred Repair, Fire/Life-Safety, ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act), and Energy Conservation projects. The following provides a brief description of each of these four types of projects along with the classification system used to prioritize individual requests:

**Deferred Repair** - Includes all elements of the building envelope, including roofs, walls, doors, and windows. It also includes the building infra-structure including heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems, electrical systems and plumbing.

Class I - Items for immediate action to provide safety and protection against costly damage. If these projects are not addressed, it could very possibly stop a program or service due to a building or system failure.

Class II - Items of imperative need to correct problems that if neglected will quickly deteriorate further into

Class I items, or that must be done to provide efficient use of the facility or system.

Class III - Additional items necessary to fully renew the facility or system.

**Fire/Life-Safety** - Includes projects which correct deficiencies which would impair the life or health of any individual within the facility or the facility itself.

Class I - Building changes/modifications for immediate action required to rectify a situation where the health and well-being of the occupants of a building are directly and clearly imperiled, or where local, state or federal codes officials have determined certain fire/life-safety improvements are needed immediately in order to ensure the safety of building occupants.

Class II - Other building changes/modifications to comply with fire/life-safety codes.

Class III - Building changes/modifications to provide better functioning or safer buildings, but not imperative for compliance with fire/life-safety building codes.

**Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)** - Accessibility Guidelines were established with the passage of this act and are the basis for all Task Force corrective action.

Class I - Structural changes/modifications for immediate action to provide access to programs or facilities regularly serving disabled or physically challenged employees.

Class II - Other structural changes or modifications to comply with ADA federal law.

Class III - Structural changes/modifications to provide better accessibility but not imperative for compliance with ADA federal law.

**Energy Conservation** - Includes any measures taken to conserve energy and includes participation in the Green Lights Program.

Class I - Items for immediate action to correct deficiencies creating excessive use of energy resources. Projects for which energy conservation measure funding applications have been or are planned to be submitted to the Nebraska Energy Office should be included in this category.

Class II - Items which if not addressed will create an additional strain on energy resources and which if accomplished would result in operating expenditure reductions.

Class III - Items which would contribute to a totally energy efficient system, but which would not be considered imperative.

# Appendix A - Definitions

---

