

*Capital Construction Budget
Recommendations and Prioritization
2005-2007 Biennium*

*for the Nebraska State Colleges,
University of Nebraska and
Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture*

Approved by the
Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education on
October 13, 2004

Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education

140 North 8th Street, Suite 300

P. O. Box 95005

Lincoln, Nebraska 68509-5005

Telephone: 402-471-2847

Fax: 402-471-2886

Website: <http://www.ccpe.state.ne.us>

Commissioners

Dr. Dick C.E. Davis, Chair

Ms. Mary Lauritzen, Vice Chair

Ms. Colleen A. Adam

Dr. Marilyn Harris

Mr. Louis W. Pofahl

Ms. Debra S. Fischer

Dr. James O'Rourke

Mr. Eric Seacrest

Mr. William Pile

Dr. David R. Powers, Executive Director

Executive Summary Capital Construction Budget Recommendations and Prioritization 2005-07 Biennium for Postsecondary Education



The *Capital Construction Budget Recommendations and Prioritization 2005-2007 Biennium* provides the Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education's funding and priority recommendations on capital construction budget requests from the Nebraska State Colleges, the University of Nebraska, and the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture at Curtis.

The Commission has identified building maintenance and facility renovation as areas needing continued attention for the coming biennium. Please see Section I of the report for additional discussion and recommendations on these issues. The following is a synopsis of building maintenance and facility renovation issues:

- **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. Institutional operating budgets for routine day-to-day building maintenance are below the bottom of a nationally recommended range. Incentives and monitored guidelines used to increase institutional expenditures on routine maintenance would provide long-term cost savings to Nebraska taxpayers.
- **Deferred Repair** - Allocations from the Building Renewal Allocation Fund for deferred repair are below the bottom of a nationally recommended range. The University also allocates funds from its operating budget in an attempt to slow the rate of growth of the deferred repair backlog, which presently exceeds \$220 million at our university and state college campuses. The Commission recommends increasing annual cigarette tax appropriations to the Building Renewal Allocation Fund from the current minimum of \$9.163 million, to a minimum of 13¢ per package (about \$13 million) in order to stop the growth of higher education's deferred repair backlog.

- **Facilities Renovation** - Thanks in large part to the efforts of the Legislature, Governor, and institutions in funding the LB 1100 initiative, annual funding for renovations is above the median of a nationally recommended range. The source of funding for renovations has been state appropriations, tuition and fees, institutional operating budgets, and private funds. The Commission applauds these efforts and supports additional funding as it becomes available to provide modern and functional facilities for students, faculty, and staff.

The following six projects have the highest priority in the Commission's prioritized list of 18 capital construction requests for the 2005-2007 biennium. This prioritized list includes eight LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal request categories. Please see Section V of the report for a complete list, in priority order, of Commission approved projects. Also refer to Section IV of the report for any funding modifications to institutional requests being recommended by the Commission.

- #1 **LB 309 Fire and Life Safety - Class I Requests for \$18.45 million**
- #2 **LB 309 Deferred Maintenance - Class I Requests for \$28.72 million**
- #3 (tie) **CSC Administration Building & Sparks Hall Renovations for \$7.06 million**
- #3 (tie) **UNO College of Public Affairs and Community Service Facility Renovation for \$14.2 million**
- #5 (tie) **PSC Emergency Power Generator for \$750,000**
- #5 (tie) **LB 309 Fire and Life Safety - Class II and III Requests for \$39.57 million**

Table of Contents



Section I - Introduction and Statewide Facilities Funding Issues Page I - 1

Section II - Existing Capital Construction Funding Commitments Page II - 1

Section III - Governing Boards' Capital Construction Budget Requests 2005-2007 Biennium Page III - 1

Section IV - Commission's Capital Construction Budget Recommendations 2005-2007 Biennium Page IV- 1

Section V - Commission's Prioritization of Approved Capital Construction Requests Page V - 1

 Priority # 1 - LB 309 Fire & Life Safety - Class I Requests Page V - 4

 Priority # 2 - LB 309 Deferred Repair - Class I Requests Page V - 6

 Priority # 3 - CSC Administration Building and Sparks Hall Renovations Page V - 8

 Priority # 3 - UNO College of Public Affairs & Community Service Facility Renovation Page V-10

 Priority # 5 - PSC Emergency Power Generator Page V-12

 Priority # 5 - LB 309 Fire & Life Safety - Class II & III Requests Page V-14

 Priority # 7 - AI Wheeler Activity Center Renovation/Addition Page V-16

 Priority # 7 - NCTA Education Center - Programming Page V-18

 Priority # 9 - CSC Armstrong P.E. Building - Programming Page V-20

 Priority #10 - LB 309 Americans with Disabilities Act - Class I Requests Page V-22

Table of Contents



Priority # 11 - WSC Carhart Science Building Renovation/Addition Page V-24

Priority # 11 - WSC Maintenance Building Renovation/Addition Page V-26

Priority # 13 - LB 309 Energy Conservation - Class I Requests Page V-28

Priority # 14 - WSC Commons and Street Improvements PSC Page V-30

Priority # 15 - Al Wheeler Activity Center Bleacher Replacement Page V-32

Priority # 16 - LB 309 Deferred Repair - Class II & III Requests Page V-34

Priority # 17 - LB 309 Americans with Disabilities Act - Classes II & III Requests Page V-36

Priority # 18 - LB 309 Energy Conservation - Classes II & III Requests Page V-38

Appendix A - Definitions Page A - 1

*Section I -
Introduction and Statewide
Facilities Funding Issues*

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



Introduction and Statutory Reference

The Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education recognizes the importance of safe, functional, well-utilized, and well-maintained facilities in supporting institutional efforts to provide exemplary programs. This principle forms the basis for the Commission's capital construction budget recommendations and prioritization for the 2005-2007 biennium.

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.”

Statewide Facilities Plan: Goals and Strategies

A high proportion of the physical assets supported by state government are found on the campuses of higher education institutions throughout Nebraska. To protect this considerable investment (about \$1.7 billion for state-supported facilities), it is critical that institutions properly plan for the construction, efficient use, and maintenance of these facilities.

The Nebraska Constitution and statutes assign the Commission with responsibility for statewide comprehensive planning for postsecondary education. The most recent update to the *Comprehensive Statewide Plan for Postsecondary Education*, approved by the Commission on September 5, 2003, identifies 14 major statewide goals and strategies. These statewide goals and strategies are intended to lead Nebraskans to an educationally and economically sound, vigorous, progressive and coordinated higher education system. Chapter Six: Statewide Facilities Plan includes one of these major statewide goals:

“Nebraskans will advocate a physical environment for each of the state’s postsecondary institutions that supports its role and mission; is well-utilized and effectively accommodates space needs; is safe, accessible, cost effective, and well maintained; and is sufficiently flexible to adapt to future changes in programs and technologies.”

Three primary strategies have been identified to accomplish this major statewide goal as follows:

- **Institutional comprehensive facilities planning will be an integral tool that supports the institution’s role and mission and strategic plan.**
- **Individual capital construction projects will support institutional strategic and comprehensive facilities plans, comply with the *Comprehensive Statewide Plan for Postsecondary Education*, and will not unnecessarily duplicate other facilities.**
- **Adequate and stable funding will be available for maintenance, repair, renovation, and major construction projects as identified in the comprehensive facilities planning and review process.**

The capital construction requests outlined in this report have been shown to meet the first two of these strategies. State government can assist institutions in accomplishing the third strategy by providing adequate and stable funding for these projects. The Commission has identified building maintenance and renovation as two essential areas in which state funding could help in meeting this strategy during the next biennium.

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, 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 & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



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 tune-ups for 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 percent and 1.5 percent of building replacement values. The University and state colleges presently fund routine maintenance at about 0.8 percent of the replacement value of their state-supported facilities. This amount has remained fairly constant despite recent reductions in state appropriations to the institutions, for which the institutions are to be commended. Exploring the creation of incentives and monitored guidelines to increase institutional expenditures on routine maintenance would provide long-term cost savings to Nebraska taxpayers. 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, and window replacement. These items are not normally contained in an annual operating budget. Recommended funding for deferred repair of facilities is between 0.5 percent and 1 percent of building replacement values. The LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal has allocated \$5.4 million per year in recent years (0.3 percent of building replacement values) for deferred repairs of state college, University, and NCTA state-supported facilities. The University has also recently funded about \$2.7 million per year in deferred repair projects from its operating budget (0.15 percent of the replacement value of their state-supported facilities). Expenditures for deferred repair have increased slightly in the past biennium. However, expenditures still fall below even the minimum nationally recommended standard. With this lack of funding, the backlog of deferred repair needs continues to grow and now exceeds \$223 million. This represents an increase of \$16 million (7.7 percent) from the last biennium. The Commission recommends increasing annual cigarette tax appropriations to the Building Renewal Allocation Fund from the current minimum of \$9.163 million to a minimum of 13 cents per package (about \$13 million) in order

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



to stop the growth of this deferred repair backlog. Other options to increase funding for deferred repair include:

- Establishing a public postsecondary education deferred repair fund financed by an annual square foot fee on state-supported facilities not being charged the 2-percent depreciation fee. Such a fund could supplement LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal funding until the recently established 2-percent depreciation charge¹ is eventually assessed for all public postsecondary educational institutions' state-supported facilities.
- Developing another bond issue to address additional deferred repair projects similar to the LB 1100 renovation and deferred repair initiative.

The minimum goal of each of these options should be to stop the continuing growth of the deferred repair backlog at the

¹LB 1100, enacted into law in 1998, requires all capital construction projects to be assessed a 2-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.

University and state college campuses. A second goal should be to begin to reduce the backlog as funding becomes available.

Renovation/Remodeling: Just as aging building systems result in 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 percent and 1.5 percent of building replacement values. Recent funding for renovation and remodeling has averaged about \$22 million per year (1.35 percent of the replacement value of the 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, and institutional operating budget expenditures, including some private funding. It is recommended that renovation and remodeling funding be maintained at an average of at least the current levels. This will be particularly important as appropriations for the LB 1100 renovation and deferred repair initiative expire in four years. The Commission recommends

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



that funding for renovations and remodeling be maintained either through creation of a new renovation initiative similar to LB 1100, through continued direct appropriations of individual projects, or creation of some other dedicated renovation/remodeling funding stream until the funds established with the 2-percent depreciation charge become sufficiently funded to address these needs.

The table on page I-8 provides a summary of the building renewal and adaptation needs for the Nebraska State Colleges, the University of Nebraska, and the 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 public use of these facilities.

Institutions benefit considerably in providing well maintained and modern facilities. Institutions nationally are recognizing the importance of facilities as a recruiting tool in this increasingly competitive atmosphere of retaining and recruiting students. Adequate and well-maintained facilities serve as an important tool for meeting this goal.

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, the 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 state colleges renovation and deferred repair projects. LB 1100 also created an annual 2-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

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



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 and reducing the \$223 million backlog of deferred repair projects are still needed. It is important for the state to increase deferred repair and building renovation/remodeling funding to address the intermediate gap in funding needs until the 2-percent depreciation charge is eventually assessed on all state-supported facilities. The adequacy of facilities plays an important part in the success of higher education and, in turn, to improving Nebraska's economy and way of life.

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 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 2005-2007 biennium:

<i>Priority</i>	<i>Statewide Facility Category</i>
<i>First</i>	Fire & Life Safety - Class I Requests ²
<i>Second</i>	Deferred Repair - Class I Requests ² , or Partially Funded Projects
<i>Third</i>	Americans w/ Disabilities Act - Class I Requests ² , or Instructional Tech. and Telecommunications
<i>Fourth</i>	Energy Conservation - Class I Requests ² , or Fire & Life Safety Class II & III Requests ²
<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 ² , New Construction Projects, or Land Acquisition - Meeting Programmatic Needs
<i>Eighth</i>	ADA - Class II & III Requests ²
<i>Ninth</i>	Energy Conservation - Class II & III Requests ²
<i>Tenth</i>	Land Acquisition - Future Expansion Needs

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

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



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
- UNO Central Utilities Plant Addition - \$3.7 million
- UNO Circulation Road Improvements - \$600,000

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



Building Renewal and Adaptation Needs at the Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska, and Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture

	Building Maintenance Expenditures			Annual Expenditures for Building Maintenance & Renov./ Remodeling
	Routine Maintenance	Deferred Repair	Renovation/ Remodeling	
	Ongoing Funding	One-time Funding	One-time Funding	
	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 institutional operating funds</i>	
<i>Recommended Funding:¹</i>	<i>1% to 1.5% of replacement value²</i>	<i>0.5% to 1% of replacement value</i>	<i>1% to 1.5% of replacement value</i>	<i>2% to 4% of replacement value</i>
<i>Existing Expenditures:</i>	<i>0.8% of replacement value</i>	<i>LB 309 - 0.3% & Univ. - 0.15% of replacement value</i>	<i>1.35% of replacement value</i>	<i>2.6% of replacement value</i>
<i>10-yr. Mid-term Goal:</i>	<i>1.25% of replacement value</i>	<i>0.75% of replacement value</i>	<i>1.25% of replacement value</i>	<i>3.25% of replacement value</i>
<i>Long-term Solution:</i>	<i>1.5% of replacement value</i>	<i>2% depreciation charge³</i>		<i>3.5% of replacement value</i>

¹ 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.

² 2004 replacement value for the Nebraska State Colleges, the University of Nebraska, and the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture state-supported facilities is estimated at \$1.68 billion.

³ LB 1100 enacted into law in 1998, requires all capital construction projects to be assessed a 2-percent 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 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 \$28,189,072 for the 2005-2007 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 and fees. The LB 1100 projects addressed some of the most pressing deferred repair and renovation needs at these institutions.

The state has also committed state appropriations to financing other state agencies capital construction projects including: NEB*SAT Network 3 Equipment Replacement; Network Educational Telecommunications Commission's (NETC) Carpenter Building Renovation; exterior masonry and structural repairs to the State Capitol; and State Capitol Renovations/Improvements.

Existing statutes designate 7 cents of the 64 cents per pack cigarette tax to the Building Renewal Allocation Fund for use by

the Task Force for Building Renewal, with the stipulation that appropriations will not be less than the FY 1997-98 appropriation of \$9.163 million. The Building Renewal Allocation Fund currently receives the minimum \$9.163 million appropriation, as 7 cents per pack of the cigarette tax currently generates only about \$7 million annually.

Section II - Existing Commitments



Capital Construction Reaffirmation Requests 2005-07 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 2004-05 Appr./Reappr.	FY 2005-06 Reaffirmation	FY 2006-07 Reaffirmation	
Nebraska State Colleges								
St. Colleges	Systemwide - Facilities Fee Projects	1100	\$10,899,217	\$4,137,087	\$1,352,426	\$1,352,426	\$1,352,426	\$2,704,852
PSC/WSC	PSC Library/Old Gym & WSC Power Plant	1	\$12,642,929	\$2,596,129	\$2,009,360	\$2,009,360	\$2,009,360	\$4,018,720
<i>Subtotal - Nebraska State Colleges</i>			\$23,542,146	\$6,733,216	\$3,361,786	\$3,361,786	\$3,361,786	\$6,723,572
University of Nebraska								
University	Systemwide - Facilities Fee Projects	1100	\$110,875,326	\$51,300,000	\$11,509,826	\$10,732,000	\$10,733,500	\$26,600,000
<i>Subtotal - University of Nebraska</i>			\$110,875,326	\$51,300,000	\$11,509,826	\$10,732,000	\$10,733,500	\$26,600,000
Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture at Curtis								
<i>Subtotal - Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture</i>			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Means of Financing								
State Building Fund (State Income Tax, Sales Tax, etc.)			\$71,642,929	\$32,096,129	\$7,909,360	\$7,909,360	\$7,909,360	\$15,818,720
Nebraska Capital Construction Fund (Cigarette Taxes)			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Cash/Revolving Funds (includes Capital Improvement Fees)			\$62,774,543	\$25,937,087	\$6,962,252	\$6,184,426	\$6,185,926	\$17,504,852
Federal Funds			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Private Funds			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Total - Nebr. State Colleges / Univ. of Nebraska / NCTA</i>			\$134,417,472	\$58,033,216	\$14,871,612	\$14,093,786	\$14,095,286	\$33,323,572

*Section III -
Governing Board Requests*

Section III - Governing Board Requests



This section identifies the 2005-2007 biennial capital construction budget requests for the LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal (postsecondary education requests only), the Nebraska State Colleges, the University of Nebraska, and the 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.

Summary of Capital Construction Requests

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

Governing board capital construction requests also identify a growing need for funding from the Building Renewal Allocation Fund to address an increasing backlog of fire and life

safety, deferred repair, the Americans with Disability Act (ADA), and energy conservation needs.

Task Force for Building Renewal Requests

In addition to requesting funds for individual capital construction projects, institutions may request funding from the Building Renewal Allocation Fund. This fund is administered by the LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal. Historically, the LB 309 Task Force's duties involved reviewing requests and allocating funds to address the deferred maintenance and energy conservation needs of state-supported buildings. In the spring of 1993, statutory revisions expanded the LB 309 Task Force's duties to include the review and allocation of funds for fire & life safety and Americans with Disability Act (ADA) projects.

The table on page III-3 of this section summarizes the 2005-2007 biennium requests for the Nebraska State Colleges, the University of Nebraska, and the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture from the Building Renewal Allocation Fund. Institutions have submitted requests from the fund totaling \$272.0 million. Matching institutional funds totaling \$66.7 million brings the total identified building renewal need to

Section III - Governing Board Requests



\$338.7 million. This amount could go higher if all institutions were to request all of their Class II and III needs to fully "renew" campus facilities as outlined in LB 309 Task Force Guidelines.

The following table provides a summary of the change in building renewal needs over the previous biennium by category. Overall needs for the Nebraska State Colleges, University, and NCTA have increased by more than 10 percent despite increased funding.

Change in Building Renewal Needs for the Nebraska State Colleges, University, and NCTA

Category	2003-2005 Biennium	2005-2007 Biennium	Increase/ (Decrease)	% Change
Fire & Life Safety	\$60,185,393	\$71,977,584	\$11,792,191	19.6%
Deferred Repair	\$207,527,023	\$223,587,729	\$16,060,706	7.7%
ADA	\$16,198,314	\$16,070,644	(\$127,670)	(0.8)%
Energy Conservtn.	\$23,687,000	\$27,069,500	\$3,382,500	14.3%
Totals	\$307,597,730	\$338,705,457	\$31,107,727	10.1%

Matching Funds for LB 309 Funding

The LB 309 Task Force requests agencies to provide matching funds for individual projects. The intent is to stretch the limited funds allocated so that more projects may be completed. 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 institutions. 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 2005-2007 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		
Fire & Life Safety											
Class I	\$1,004,700	\$771,375	\$1,006,825	\$2,782,900	\$44,000	\$11,231,057	\$1,820,700	\$2,564,000	\$15,659,757	\$9,600	\$18,452,257
Class II	\$0	\$325,210	\$807,500	\$1,132,710	\$7,400,000	\$25,022,008	\$122,578	\$1,480,000	\$34,024,586	\$0	\$35,157,296
Class III	\$0	\$0	\$114,750	\$114,750	\$600,000	\$3,541,144	\$0	\$156,000	\$4,297,144	\$0	\$4,411,894
<i>Subtotals</i>	<i>\$1,004,700</i>	<i>\$1,096,585</i>	<i>\$1,929,075</i>	<i>\$4,030,360</i>	<i>\$8,044,000</i>	<i>\$39,794,209</i>	<i>\$1,943,278</i>	<i>\$4,200,000</i>	<i>\$53,981,487</i>	<i>\$9,600</i>	<i>\$58,021,447</i>
Deferred Repair											
Class I	\$976,225	\$1,118,813	\$1,514,700	\$3,609,738	\$6,264,000	\$11,855,432	\$4,600,724	\$2,325,200	\$25,045,356	\$62,400	\$28,717,493
Class II	\$0	\$192,100	\$1,153,875	\$1,345,975	\$14,000,000	\$20,726,931	\$9,596,524	\$5,544,000	\$49,867,455	\$0	\$51,213,430
Class III	\$0	\$0	\$639,200	\$639,200	\$1,880,000	\$71,386,780	\$25,112,256	\$232,000	\$98,611,036	\$0	\$99,250,236
<i>Subtotals</i>	<i>\$976,225</i>	<i>\$1,310,913</i>	<i>\$3,307,775</i>	<i>\$5,594,913</i>	<i>\$22,144,000</i>	<i>\$103,969,143</i>	<i>\$39,309,504</i>	<i>\$8,101,200</i>	<i>\$173,523,847</i>	<i>\$62,400</i>	<i>\$179,181,159</i>
Americans with Disabilities Act											
Class I	\$0	\$289,000	\$280,500	\$569,500	\$784,000	\$861,537	\$464,520	\$432,000	\$2,542,057	\$0	\$3,111,557
Class II	\$0	\$195,500	\$0	\$195,500	\$100,000	\$3,222,820	\$0	\$300,000	\$3,622,820	\$0	\$3,818,320
Class III	\$0	\$0	\$1,319,430	\$1,319,430	\$200,000	\$4,543,142	\$0	\$0	\$4,743,142	\$0	\$6,062,572
<i>Subtotals</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$484,500</i>	<i>\$1,599,930</i>	<i>\$2,084,430</i>	<i>\$1,084,000</i>	<i>\$8,627,499</i>	<i>\$464,520</i>	<i>\$732,000</i>	<i>\$10,908,020</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$12,992,449</i>
Energy Conservation											
Class I	\$506,600	\$191,250	\$0	\$697,850	\$80,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,350,000	\$1,430,000	\$16,800	\$2,144,650
Class II	\$0	\$1,147,500	\$21,250	\$1,168,750	\$17,200,000	\$0	\$0	\$164,000	\$17,364,000	\$0	\$18,532,750
Class III	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$988,000	\$1,088,000	\$0	\$1,088,000
<i>Subtotals</i>	<i>\$506,600</i>	<i>\$1,338,750</i>	<i>\$21,250</i>	<i>\$1,866,600</i>	<i>\$17,380,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$2,502,000</i>	<i>\$19,882,000</i>	<i>\$16,800</i>	<i>\$21,765,400</i>
Total Task Force for Building Renewal Requests											
<i>Ttl. Request</i>	<i>\$2,487,525</i>	<i>\$4,230,748</i>	<i>\$6,858,030</i>	<i>\$13,576,302</i>	<i>\$48,652,000</i>	<i>\$152,390,851</i>	<i>\$41,717,303</i>	<i>\$15,535,200</i>	<i>\$258,295,354</i>	<i>\$88,800</i>	<i>\$271,960,456</i>
<i>Matching \$</i>	<i>\$438,975</i>	<i>\$746,603</i>	<i>\$1,210,241</i>	<i>\$2,395,818</i>	<i>\$12,163,000</i>	<i>\$38,001,288</i>	<i>\$10,278,895</i>	<i>\$3,883,800</i>	<i>\$64,326,983</i>	<i>\$22,200</i>	<i>\$66,745,001</i>
<i>Ttl. Proj. \$</i>	<i>\$2,926,500</i>	<i>\$4,977,350</i>	<i>\$8,068,270</i>	<i>\$15,972,120</i>	<i>\$60,815,000</i>	<i>\$190,392,139</i>	<i>\$51,996,198</i>	<i>\$19,419,000</i>	<i>\$322,622,337</i>	<i>\$111,000</i>	<i>\$338,705,457</i>
	<i>0.9%</i>	<i>1.5%</i>	<i>2.4%</i>	<i>4.7%</i>	<i>18.0%</i>	<i>56.2%</i>	<i>15.4%</i>	<i>5.7%</i>	<i>95.3%</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 2005-2007 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 2005-2007 Biennium

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Governing Bd. Priority	Total Request	Prior Expenditure	FY 2004-05 App/Reap	FY 2005-06 Request	FY 2006-07 Request	Future Request
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY - CLASS I	01	\$3,274,000	\$0	\$0	\$3,274,000	\$0	\$0
DEFERRED REPAIR - CLASS I	02	\$4,246,750	\$0	\$0	\$4,246,750	\$0	\$0
ADA - CLASS I	03	\$670,000	\$0	\$0	\$670,000	\$0	\$0
CSC - ADMIN. BLDG. & SPARKS HALL RENOVATIONS	04	\$7,065,550	\$10,000	\$0	\$2,680,450	\$4,375,100	\$0
WSC - MAINTENANCE RENOVATION & ADDITION	05	\$2,059,477	\$11,369	\$0	\$1,070,000	\$978,108	\$0
PSC - EMERGENCY POWER GENERATOR	06	\$750,000	\$0	\$0	\$750,000	\$0	\$0
PSC - AL WHEELER CENTER BLEACHER RPLCMNT.	07	\$157,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$157,000	\$0
WSC - CARHART SCIENCE RENOVATION/ADDITION	08	\$18,435,111	\$65,000	\$1,950,000	\$1,376,743	\$5,898,217	\$9,145,151
PSC - AL WHEELER CENTER RENOVATION/ADDITION	09	\$4,799,044	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$4,699,044
WSC - PAVING PROJECT	10	\$5,066,156	\$0	\$35,000	\$3,083,933	\$1,947,223	\$0
CSC - ARMSTRONG RENOVATION PROGRAMMING	11	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,000	\$0
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY - CLASS II	12	\$1,332,600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,332,600	\$0
DEFERRED REPAIR - CLASS II	13	\$1,583,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,583,500	\$0
ADA - CLASS II	14	\$230,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$230,000	\$0
ENERGY CONSERVATION - CLASS I	15	\$821,000	\$0	\$0	\$821,000	\$0	\$0
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY - CLASS III	16	\$135,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$135,000
DEFERRED REPAIR - CLASS III	17	\$752,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$752,500
ADA - CLASS III	18	\$1,552,270	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,552,270
ENERGY CONSERVATION - CLASS II	19	\$1,375,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,375,000	\$0
ENERGY CONSERVATION - CLASS III	20	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL		\$54,324,958	\$86,369	\$1,985,000	\$17,972,876	\$17,996,748	\$16,283,965
FUND SOURCE		Total Request	Prior Expenditure	FY 2004-05 App/Reap	FY 2005-06 Request	FY 2006-07 Request	Future Request
GENERAL FUND		\$43,594,900	\$0	\$0	\$13,545,618	\$16,885,282	\$13,164,000
CASH FUND		\$121,369	\$86,369	\$35,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
FEDERAL FUND		\$184,800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$184,800
REVOLVING FUND		\$292,500	\$0	\$292,500	\$0	\$0	\$0
OTHER FUND		\$6,603,009	\$0	\$1,657,500	\$1,943,008	\$433,301	\$2,569,200
SUBTOTAL		\$50,796,578	\$86,369	\$1,985,000	\$15,488,626	\$17,318,583	\$15,918,000
REVENUE BONDS		\$1,140,925	\$0	\$0	\$1,140,925	\$0	\$0
LB309 COOPERATIVE FUND		\$2,387,455	\$0	\$0	\$1,343,325	\$678,165	\$365,965
SUBTOTAL		\$3,528,380	\$0	\$0	\$2,484,250	\$678,165	\$365,965
TOTAL		\$54,324,958	\$86,369	\$1,985,000	\$17,972,876	\$17,996,748	\$16,283,965

Section III - Governing Board Requests



University of Nebraska

The table on the following page provides the University of Nebraska's Capital Construction Budget Request 2005-2007 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 2005-2007 Biennium

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Governing Bd. Priority	Total Request	Prior Expenditure	FY 2004-05 App/Reap	FY 2005-06 Request	FY 2006-07 Request	Future Request
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY - CLASS I	01	\$19,321,821	\$0	\$0	\$19,321,821	\$0	\$0
UNO - CPACS - ENGINEERING BLDG. RENOV.	02	\$14,200,000	\$0	\$0	\$525,000	\$13,675,000	\$0
ADA - CLASS I	03	\$3,160,921	\$0	\$0	\$3,160,921	\$0	\$0
DEFERRED REPAIR - CLASS I	04	\$31,329,365	\$0	\$0	\$31,329,365	\$0	\$0
ENERGY CONSERVATION - CLASS I	05	\$1,787,500	\$0	\$0	\$1,787,500	\$0	\$0
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY - CLASS II	06	\$42,530,733	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$42,530,733	\$0
ADA - CLASS II	07	\$4,528,525	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,528,525	\$0
DEFERRED REPAIR - CLASS II	08	\$62,334,319	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$62,334,319	\$0
ENERGY CONSERVATION - CLASS II	09	\$21,705,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21,705,000	\$0
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY - CLASS III	10	\$5,371,430	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,371,430
ADA - CLASS III	11	\$5,928,928	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,928,928
DEFERRED REPAIR - CLASS III	12	\$123,263,795	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$123,263,795
ENERGY CONSERVATION - CLASS III	13	\$1,360,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,360,000
TOTAL		\$336,822,337	\$0	\$0	\$56,124,607	\$144,773,577	\$135,924,153

FUND SOURCE	Total Request	Prior Expenditure	FY 2004-05 App/Reap	FY 2005-06 Request	FY 2006-07 Request	Future Request
GENERAL FUND	\$277,546,853	\$0	\$0	\$45,899,748	\$119,768,749	\$111,878,356
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
SUBTOTAL	\$277,546,853	\$0	\$0	\$45,899,748	\$119,768,749	\$111,878,356
REVENUE BONDS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LB309 COOPERATIVE FUND	\$59,275,484	\$0	\$0	\$10,224,859	\$25,004,828	\$24,045,797
SUBTOTAL	\$59,275,484	\$0	\$0	\$10,224,859	\$25,004,828	\$24,045,797
TOTAL	\$336,822,337	\$0	\$0	\$56,124,607	\$144,773,577	\$135,924,153

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 2005-2007 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 2005-2007 Biennium

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Governing Bd. Priority	Total Request	Prior Expenditure	FY 2004-05 App/Reap	FY 2005-06 Request	FY 2006-07 Request	Future Request
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	\$78,000	\$0	\$0	\$78,000	\$0	\$0
ENERGY CONSERVATION - CLASS I	04	\$21,000	\$0	\$0	\$21,000	\$0	\$0
TOTAL		\$166,000	\$0	\$0	\$166,000	\$0	\$0

FUND SOURCE	Total Request	Prior Expenditure	FY 2004-05 App/Reap	FY 2005-06 Request	FY 2006-07 Request	Future Request
GENERAL FUND	\$143,800	\$0	\$0	\$143,800	\$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
SUBTOTAL	\$143,800	\$0	\$0	\$143,800	\$0	\$0
REVENUE BONDS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LB309 COOPERATIVE FUND	\$22,200	\$0	\$0	\$22,200	\$0	\$0
SUBTOTAL	\$22,200	\$0	\$0	\$22,200	\$0	\$0
TOTAL	\$166,000	\$0	\$0	\$166,000	\$0	\$0

Section III - Governing Board Requests



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

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



The table at the end of Section IV lists all approved capital construction requests from the Nebraska State Colleges, the University of Nebraska, and the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture (NCTA). 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 \$270,000 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.

In addition to requesting funds for individual capital construction projects, institutions have requested funding from the Building Renewal Allocation Fund. This fund is administered by the LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal. The LB 309 Task Force's statutory duties involve reviewing these requests and allocating funds to address the fire & life safety, deferred repair, the Americans with Disability Act

(ADA), and energy conservation needs of state-supported buildings as funding allows.

Summary of Recommended Budget Modifications

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

- *LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal Capital Construction Budget Requests:* Existing statutes distributes a minimum of \$9.163 million annually from the 64 cents per pack cigarette tax to the Building Renewal Allocation Fund. The Commission recommends increasing the annual appropriation to the Building Renewal Allocation Fund to \$13 million per year (equivalent to 13 cents of the cigarette tax) in order to stop the growth of the deferred repair backlog, which currently exceeds \$223 million. The deferred repair backlog has grown by 7.7 percent (\$16 million) over the past biennium as represented by institutional requests. Other options may also be considered to address the growing building renewal needs. The minimum goal of any option being considered should

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



be to provide an adequate and stable funding stream that will stop the continuing growth of the deferred repair backlog on University and state college campuses. A second goal should be to begin reducing the backlog of building renewal needs as funding becomes available.

- *CSC Administration Building and Sparks Hall Renovation:* The Commission recommends modifying the cash flow to account for a more realistic expectation of project expenditures. Construction funding for the renovation of the Administration Building will likely extend into the 2007-2009 biennium.
- *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.

A summary of each capital construction request is included on the following pages that outlines each individual request including the amount of state funding 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: \$271,960,456 (higher ed only)

Project Description: The request includes Fire & Life Safety, Deferred Repair, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and Energy Conservation requests from the Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska, and Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture. Institutions would also provide \$66,745,001 in matching funds for these requests, bringing the total identified need for building renewal to \$338,705,457.

Commission Approval: Approval not required as the Task Force for Building Renewal has statutory responsibility for review and allocation of individual building renewal projects.

Budget Recommendations: The Commission recommends increasing annual cigarette tax appropriations to the

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



Building Renewal Allocation Fund from the current \$9.163 million annual appropriation, to a minimum of 13 cents per package (about \$13 million) in order to adequately meet the most urgent fire & life safety needs and stop the growth of the deferred repair backlog. Other options could also be explored to address these needs. However, the minimum goal of any option selected should be to stop the continuing growth of the \$223 million deferred repair backlog at the University and state college campuses by providing a stable and ongoing source of funding. A second goal should be to begin to reduce the backlog of projects as funding becomes available.

Nebraska State Colleges

Capital Construction Budget Requests:

CSC Administration Building & Sparks Hall Renovations

Budget Request: \$7,055,550
Project Description: The project would renovate two facilities and allow for the demolition of a third outdated building. Sparks Hall was constructed in 1914 as a housing facility. Renovation of this building would allow for the consolidation of the campus administration into this

renovated facility. The Administration building was originally constructed in 1911 and has never undergone a major renovation. The facility houses general classrooms, School of Arts & Sciences and Education Department space, along with campus administrative offices. The Education Department would be moved into the Administration Building following completion of this renovation, allowing for the subsequent demolition of Hildreth Hall. 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: Administration Building Renovation was approved on October 5, 1999, and the Sparks Hall Renovation/Addition was approved on July 27, 2004.

Budget Recommendations: The Commission recommends modifying the cash flow to account for a more realistic expectation of project expenditures. Construction funding for the renovation of the Administration will likely extend into the 2007-2009 biennium.

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



CSC Armstrong P.E. Building - Programming

Budget Request: \$20,000 (A future state funding request to complete design and construction would follow completion of the program statement)

Project Description: This request would provide funding to develop a program statement to renovate the Armstrong P.E. Building. 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. The Commission would review any request for design and construction funding following completion of programming.

Budget Recommendations: Provide funding as outlined in the institution's capital construction budget request.

PSC Al 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 for deferred repair projects per Commission rules and procedures.

Budget Recommendations: Provide funding as outlined in the institution's capital construction budget request.

PSC Al Wheeler Activity Center Renovation/Addition

Planning

Budget Request: \$4,799,044

Project Description: The request for the 2005-2007 biennium is to provide funding for design of this project. The project would renovate the 1980 facility, and relocate campus health center, athletic offices, athletic locker rooms, training room, and storage functions presently located in an adjacent residence hall into a newly constructed addition. The vacated A.D. Majors Hall, originally constructed in 1959, could then be demolished.

Commission Approval: Approved September 16, 2004

Budget Recommendations: Provide funding as outlined in the institution's capital construction budget request.

PSC Emergency Power Generator

Budget Request: \$750,000

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

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



the Campus Service Building and the new Library operational, allowing students to temporarily relocate into these facilities from the residence halls.

Commission Approval: Approval not required for life safety projects per Commission rules and procedures.

Budget Recommendations: Provide funding as outlined in the institution's capital construction budget request.

this project. The Task Force for Building Renewal is currently funding an addition to the building for an elevator, emergency exit stairwell, and ADA restrooms.

Commission Approval: Approved October 13, 2004

Budget Recommendations: Provide funding as outlined in the institution's capital construction budget request.

WSC Carhart Science Building Renovation/Addition

Budget Request: \$13,835,311

Project Description: This request would provide funding for the renovation and addition to the Carhart Science Building, originally constructed in 1969. The building houses the Department of Physical Sciences and Math, and the Department of Life Sciences. The building also contains a planetarium and natural history museum. Renovation work would include replacement of the mechanical/HVAC system including fume hoods. The renovation would also replace outdated equipment and finishes, and address accessibility and functional deficiencies. A proposed addition would provide space for an expanded museum, student commons, laboratory, relocated greenhouse, and study space. Private and federal funding totaling \$2,584,800 would be used to supplement

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



WSC Facilities Services Building Renovation/Addition

Budget Request: \$2,048,108

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: Provide funding as outlined in the institution's capital construction budget request.

WSC Commons and Street Improvements

Budget Request: \$1,513,922

Project Description: This request would replace two existing College-owned streets south of the core of academic buildings on campus. This project would also repair existing campus roads, and address accessibility and safety issues. Revenue bond funding would be used to improve campus parking as a part of this project. Private funding would be used to convert J.G.W. Lewis Drive into a pedestrian mall. Lewis Drive presently dissects the academic core on campus. The project would be completed in three phases to maintain vehicular access and adequate parking throughout construction of the project.

Commission Approval: July 27, 2004

Budget Recommendations: Provide funding as outlined in the institution's capital construction budget request.

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



University of Nebraska

Capital Construction Budget Request:

UNO CPACS Facility Renovation

Budget Request: \$14,200,000

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. Construction funding will likely extend into the 2007-2009 biennium.

Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture

Capital Construction Budget Request:

NCTA Education Center - Programming

Budget Request: \$55,000 (A future state funding request to complete design and construction would follow completion of the program statement)

Project Description: Program statement funding is being requested to begin planning for the replacement of antiquated space on campus and provide 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. The Commission would review any request for design and construction funding following completion of programming.

Budget Recommendations: Provide funding as outlined in the institution's capital construction budget request.

Capital Construction Budget Recommendations 2005-2007 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 2005-06	FY 2006-07		
Reaffirmation of Partially Funded Projects							
St. Colleges	Systemwide - Facilities Fee Projects	\$10,899,217	\$5,489,513	\$1,352,426	\$1,352,426	\$2,704,852	Approved 7 Projects
PSC/WSC	PSC Library/Old Gym & WSC Power Plant	\$12,642,929	\$4,605,489	\$2,009,360	\$2,009,360	\$4,018,720	Approved
University	Systemwide - Facilities Fee Projects	\$110,875,326	\$62,809,826	\$10,732,000	\$10,733,500	\$26,600,000	Approved 13 Projects
<i>Subtotal - Reaffirmations</i>		<i>\$134,417,472</i>	<i>\$72,904,828</i>	<i>\$14,093,786</i>	<i>\$14,095,286</i>	<i>\$33,323,572</i>	
LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal							
St. Col./Univ.	ADA - Class I Requests	\$3,830,921	\$0	\$0	\$3,830,921	\$0	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	ADA - Class II and III Requests	\$12,239,723	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,239,723	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Deferred Repair - Class I Requests	\$35,654,115	\$0	\$17,827,058	\$17,827,058	\$0	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Deferred Repair - Class II & III Requests	\$187,933,614	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$187,933,614	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Energy Conservation - Class I Requests	\$2,629,500	\$0	\$0	\$2,629,500	\$0	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Energy Conservation - Class II and III Reqsts.	\$24,440,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24,440,000	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Fire & Life Safety - Class I Requests	\$22,607,821	\$0	\$16,955,866	\$5,651,955	\$0	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Fire & Life Safety - Class II and III Requests	\$49,369,763	\$0	\$0	\$4,936,976	\$44,432,787	Approval Not Required
<i>Subtotal - LB 309 Task Force Requests</i>		<i>\$338,705,457</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$34,782,923</i>	<i>\$34,876,410</i>	<i>\$269,046,124</i>	
Nebraska State Colleges							
CSC	Admin. Building & Sparks Hall Renovations	\$7,065,550	\$10,000	\$2,680,450	\$2,187,550	\$2,187,550	Approved
CSC	Armstrong Renovation Programming	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$20,000	\$0	Approval Not Required
PSC	Al Wheeler Activity Center Bleacher Rplcmnt.	\$157,000	\$0	\$0	\$157,000	\$0	Approval Not Required
PSC	Al Wheeler Activity Cntr Renov./Add. Design	\$4,799,044	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$4,699,044	Approved
PSC	Emergency Power Generator	\$750,000	\$0	\$750,000	\$0	\$0	Approval Not Required
WSC	Carhart Science Building Renovation/Add.	\$18,435,111	\$2,015,000	\$1,376,743	\$5,898,217	\$9,145,151	Approved
WSC	Maintenance Building Renovation/Addition	\$2,059,477	\$11,369	\$1,070,000	\$978,108	\$0	Approved
WSC	Paving Project	\$5,066,156	\$35,000	\$3,083,933	\$1,947,223	\$0	Approval Not Required
<i>Subtotal - Nebraska State Colleges</i>		<i>\$38,352,338</i>	<i>\$2,071,369</i>	<i>\$8,961,126</i>	<i>\$11,288,098</i>	<i>\$16,031,745</i>	
University of Nebraska							
UNO	Col of Pub Affairs & Com Serv Facility Renov.	\$14,200,000	\$0	\$525,000	\$6,837,500	\$6,837,500	Approved
<i>Subtotal - University of Nebraska</i>		<i>\$14,200,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$525,000</i>	<i>\$6,837,500</i>	<i>\$6,837,500</i>	
Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture at Curtis							
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>	
Means of Financing							
State Bldg. Funds/NE Capital Constr. Funds/Cig. Taxes		\$389,525,620	\$41,662,989	\$42,509,492	\$53,841,594	\$251,511,544	
Cash/Revolving Funds (incl. CIF & LB 309 Matching Funds)		\$129,933,413	\$33,313,208	\$12,769,410	\$12,877,399	\$70,973,396	
Federal Funds		\$184,800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$184,800	
Revenue Bonds		\$1,140,925	\$0	\$1,140,925	\$0	\$0	
Private Funds		\$4,945,509	\$0	\$1,943,008	\$433,301	\$2,569,200	
<i>Total - Nebr. State Colleges / Univ. of Nebr. / NCTA</i>		<i>\$525,730,267</i>	<i>\$74,976,197</i>	<i>\$58,362,835</i>	<i>\$67,152,294</i>	<i>\$325,238,941</i>	

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

Section V - Commission Prioritization



The Commission's priorities for the 2005-2007 biennium are included on page V-3. This recommended sequencing of approved capital construction projects combines the separate budget requests from the Nebraska State Colleges, the University of Nebraska, and the 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.

It is understood that funding is not available to complete all of the capital construction needs identified on the prioritized list. The Commission's prioritized list is intended to identify from a statewide perspective what the most urgent capital construction needs are for the coming biennium, and to assist the Governor and Legislature in developing a strategy to address these needs.

The Commission recommends that as revenue become available, projects be funded in their entirety. Partially funding a capital construction request is not recommended for the following reasons: 1) Partial funding increases the overall cost of a project between 5 percent and 10 percent due to additional contractor start-up and shut-down costs; 2) Partial funding also increases inflationary costs as a result of phasing these projects; and 3) Partially completed projects do not fully meet the needs of the students, faculty, staff, and public that utilize these

facilities, and creates further disruptions when the project is finally completed.

Methodology

The Commission has used ten weighted criteria to evaluate individual capital construction 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 at <http://www.ccpe.state.ne.us/PublicDoc/CCPE/Rules/ccpIntro.asp>. 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 is to protect building occupants and prevent further deterioration of the state's existing physical assets.

Section V - Commission Prioritization



Sector Initiatives

The Commission encourages governing boards to target specific areas of their capital budget requests as "sector initiatives." These initiatives are then considered in the Commission's prioritization of individual capital construction project requests. This allows each sector to identify programmatic initiatives related to capital construction requests that are a high priority to the institution and the state. The need for a facility cannot be determined solely on how much space an institution requires or the condition of its buildings. Facilities should also be evaluated on the basis of whether they address strategic initiatives for postsecondary education, or respond expeditiously to meet Nebraskans' educational, economic, and societal needs. This allows each sector to identify its immediate or short-term initiatives that relate to capital construction.

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 recreational facilities to meet accreditation standards, enhance program quality and access, and provide quality space for physical activities.

- Protecting the investment in facilities and grounds at the state colleges through careful upkeep, responsible utilization of existing structures, and orderly planning.

University of Nebraska:

- The University's first sector initiative is the enhancement of programs associated with the College of Public Affairs and Community Service.
- The second sector initiative is the safe, efficient, cost-effective use of existing facilities.
- The third sector initiative is enhancement of instructional capabilities. Renovation of the old College of Engineering Building supports development of new formats, techniques, physical spaces and instructional technology.

Statewide Capital Priority Recommendations 2005-2007 Biennium for the Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska & Nebr. College of Technical Agriculture



Priority	Institution	Project Title ¹	Funding Amount Recommended	Prioritization Criteria											Total Points	Possible Points	Percent of Points
				Statewide Facilities Category Rank	Sector Initiatives	Inst. Strategic & Long-Range Plan	Immediacy of Need	Addressing Quality of Facility	Avoid Unnecessary Duplication	Appropriate Quantity of Space	Statewide Role & Mission	Bldg. Maintenance Expenditures	Ongoing Costs				
1.	St. Col./Univ.	Fire & Life Safety - Class I Requests	\$22,607,821	30.0	8.6	---	10.0	10.0	10.0	---	4.5	4.7	3.0	80.8	85	95%	
2.	St. Col./Univ.	Deferred Repair - Class I Requests	\$35,654,115	27.0	10.0	---	10.0	9.0	10.0	---	4.2	4.2	3.0	77.5	85	91%	
3.	CSC	Admin. Building & Sparks Hall Renovations	\$7,055,550	18.8	10.0	10.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	2.0	82.3	100	82%	
3.	UNO	Col of Pub Affairs & Com Serv Facility Renov.	\$14,200,000	18.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	5.0	4.6	4.0	3.0	81.6	100	82%	
5.	PSC	Emergency Power Generator	\$750,000	21.0	10.0	---	9.0	7.0	10.0	---	3.8	5.0	3.0	68.8	85	81%	
5.	St. Col./Univ.	Fire & Life Safety - Class II and III Requests	\$49,369,763	21.0	9.7	---	9.0	7.0	10.0	---	4.3	4.4	3.0	68.4	85	81%	
7.	PSC	AI Wheeler Activity Cntr Renov./Add. Design	\$4,799,044	18.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	6.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	79.0	100	79%	
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%	
9.	CSC	Armstrong Renovation Programming	\$20,000	18.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	4.0	10.0	---	5.0	5.0	3.0	73.0	95	77%	
10.	St. Col./Univ.	ADA - Class I Requests	\$3,830,921	24.0	0.0	---	9.0	8.0	10.0	---	4.6	4.0	3.0	62.6	85	74%	
11.	WSC	Carhart Science Building Renovation/Add.	\$16,420,111	17.2	9.9	10.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	4.6	2.5	2.0	73.1	100	73%	
11.	WSC	Maintenance Building Renovation/Addition	\$2,048,108	16.7	7.8	10.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	5.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	72.9	100	73%	
13.	St. Col./Univ.	Energy Conservation - Class I Requests	\$2,629,500	21.0	0.0	---	9.0	7.0	10.0	---	4.7	4.3	5.0	61.0	85	72%	
14.	WSC	Paving Project	\$5,031,156	17.5	8.9	10.0	7.0	4.0	10.0	---	4.7	2.5	3.0	67.5	95	71%	
15.	PSC	AI 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%	
16.	St. Col./Univ.	Deferred Repair - Class II & III Requests	\$187,933,614	12.0	10.0	---	7.0	4.0	10.0	---	4.2	4.7	3.0	54.8	85	65%	
17.	St. Col./Univ.	ADA - Class II and III Requests	\$12,239,723	9.0	0.0	---	6.0	3.0	10.0	---	4.3	4.6	3.0	39.9	85	47%	
18.	St. Col./Univ.	Energy Conservation - Class II and III Reqsts.	\$24,440,000	6.0	0.0	---	6.0	2.0	10.0	---	4.7	2.7	4.0	35.5	85	42%	
Possible Points for each Prioritization Criterion			\$389,241,426	30.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0		100		

¹ 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 Requests



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. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Fire & Life Safety - Class I requests are ranked 1st out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	30	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The University has designated “. . . the safe, efficient, cost effective use of existing facilities” as a sector initiative. This request addresses safe use of existing facilities. A weighted average of Fire & Life Safety - Class I requests from the University was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	8.55	10
<p>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of the need for the project.</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>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Fire & 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. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities at these institutions.</p>	10	10
<p>7. The amount of space requested as compared with a program's needs. <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <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>	4.55	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <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>	4.72	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects should not increase long-term facility operational and maintenance costs at institutions.</p>	3	5
TOTAL POINTS	80.8	85
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	95%	

#2 LB 309 / Deferred Repair - Class I Requests



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. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories. <i>Comments:</i> Deferred Repair - Class I requests are ranked 2nd out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	27	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative." <i>Comments:</i> The Nebraska State Colleges 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. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of the need for the project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects require immediate action to avoid costly damage to buildings and equipment.</p>	10	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <i>Comments:</i> Deferred Repair - Class I requests are awarded nine points for this criterion.</p>	9	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
6. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.	10	10
<i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities at these institutions.		
7. The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs.	0	0
<i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.		
8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities.	4.23	5
<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.		
9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.	4.24	5
<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.		
10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.	3	5
<i>Comments:</i> These projects should not increase long-term facility operational and maintenance costs at institutions.		
TOTAL POINTS	77.5	85
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS		91%

#3 CSC Administration Building Renovation & Sparks Hall Renovation/Addition



Date of Governing Board Approval: May 14, 1999 / June 10, 2004

Date of Commission Approval: October 5, 1999 / July 27, 2004

Phasing Considerations: Sparks Hall needs to be completed prior to beginning Administration Building interior renovation.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The project includes 5,545 net assignable square feet (12.89% of project space) of instructional technology space which is the 3rd ranked statewide facilities category. The remaining 37,475 NASF (87.11% of project space) is renovation/replacement space which is the 5th ranked statewide facilities category.</p>	18.77	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The Nebraska State Colleges Board of Trustees designated “upgrading classroom and recreational 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 these initiatives.</p>	10	10
<p>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices.</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 and Sparks Hall. 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. The immediacy of the need for the project.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project should be funded in the coming biennium in order to renovate antiquated facilities that lacks modern instructional technologies.</p>	9	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> These buildings, 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. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request would result in a decrease in the amount of space on campus after the demolition of Hildreth Hall.</p>	10	10
<p>7. The amount of space requested as compared with a program's needs. <i>Comments:</i> CSC utilized existing classrooms on campus an average of 17.5 hours per week during the 1999 fall semester, compared to nationally recognized standards of 30 hours per week for four-year institutions. The demolition of Hildreth Hall following the renovation of the Administration Building would result in the net reduction of 5 classrooms and over 340 student stations on campus.</p>	5	5
<p>8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This proposal affects undergraduate instructional (83.26%) and administrative (16.74%) space.</p>	4.5	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Expenditures per gross square foot of state-supported buildings for routine building maintenance at CSC are 26 percent below the median of a national survey of masters institutions. However, CSC expended 2.24 percent of its state appropriations and tuition on building maintenance, which represents a concerted effort to maintain its state-supported facilities with limited available funds.</p>	5	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> The updated program statement indicated the need for increased operating and maintenance (O&M) costs for Administration Building utilities and providing O&M for the addition to Sparks Hall.</p>	2	5
TOTAL POINTS	82.3	100
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	82%	

#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>1. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project involves renovation/remodeling/replacement which is ranked 5th out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	18	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</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>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices.</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>4. The immediacy of the need for the project.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project should be funded in the coming biennium.</p>	9	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</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. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request would result in a decrease in the amount of space on campus after demolition of annexes currently occupied by the CPACS programs.</p>	10	10
<p>7. The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs. <i>Comments:</i> The amount of space identified in the program statement has been adequately justified.</p>	5	5
<p>8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This proposal affects undergraduate instructional (63%) and graduate instructional & research (37%) space.</p>	4.63	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Expenditures per gross square foot of state-supported buildings for routine building maintenance at UNO are 8 percent below the median of a national survey of doctorate/masters institutions. UNO expended 1.92% of its state appropriations and tuition on building maintenance, which is below the 2.2% established by the Commission as demonstrating a minimal effort to maintain facilities.</p>	4	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> This request does not require additional state resources for facility’s operations and maintenance.</p>	3	5
TOTAL POINTS	81.6	100
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	82%	

#5 PSC / Emergency Power Generator



Date of Governing Board Approval: June 10, 2004
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. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories. <i>Comments:</i> This project is similar to Fire & Life Safety - Class II & III requests which are ranked 4th out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	21	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative." <i>Comments:</i> The Nebraska State Colleges Board of Trustees designated "protecting the investment in facilities and grounds at the State Colleges through careful upkeep . . ." as a sector initiative. This request would address this designated sector initiative by providing minimal boiler operations during a lengthy power outage.</p>	10	10
<p>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of the need for the project. <i>Comments:</i> This project is required in the coming biennium to protect campus buildings and their occupants.</p>	9	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <i>Comments:</i> This project is comparable to a Fire & Life Safety - Classes II & III request which are awarded seven points for this criterion.</p>	7	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
6. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities.	10	10
7. The amount of space requested as compared with a program's needs. <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.	0	0
8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This request would involve academic support (38.8%) and administrative/operational support (61.2%) space. A weighted average of points awarded for each type of space was used in awarding points for this request.	3.83	5
9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Expenditures per gross square foot of state-supported buildings for routine building maintenance at PSC are 18 percent above the median of a national survey of masters/baccalaureate institutions. PSC expended 3.83% of its state appropriations and tuition on building maintenance, which represents a tremendous effort to maintain its state-supported facilities with limited available funds.	5	5
10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> This request does not require additional state resources for facility's operations & maintenance.	3	5
TOTAL POINTS	68.8	85
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS		81%

#5 LB 309 / Fire & Life Safety - Classes II & III Requests



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. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories. <i>Comments:</i> Fire & Life Safety - Class II & III requests are ranked 4th out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	21	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative." <i>Comments:</i> The University has designated “. . . the safe, efficient, cost effective use of existing facilities” as a sector initiative. This request addresses safe use of existing facilities. A weighted average of Fire & Life Safety - Class II & III requests from the University was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	9.70	10
<p>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of the need for the project. <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. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <i>Comments:</i> Fire & Life Safety - Classes II & III requests are awarded seven points for this criterion.</p>	7	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
6. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.	10	10
<i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities at these institutions.		
7. The amount of space requested as compared with a program's needs.	0	0
<i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.		
8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities.	4.34	5
<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.		
9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.	4.40	5
<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.		
10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.	3	5
<i>Comments:</i> These projects should not increase long-term facility operational and maintenance costs at institutions.		
TOTAL POINTS	68.4	85
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS		81%

#7 PSC / Al Wheeler Activity Center Renovation/Addition



Date of Governing Board Approval: June 11, 2002
Date of Commission Approval: September 16, 2004
Phasing Considerations: No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project involves renovation/remodeling/replacement which is ranked 5th out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	18	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The Nebraska State Colleges Board of Trustees designated "upgrading classroom & recreational 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 addresses these initiatives.</p>	10	10
<p>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The PSC Campus Facilities Master Plan approved by the Board of Trustees on January 21, 2000, identified the need to renovate and expand the Al Wheeler Activity Center and demolish A.D. Majors Hall. 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. The immediacy of the need for the project.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project is needed within the next couple of bienniums to address these program needs.</p>	8	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The building, currently in good condition, will address all physical and functional deficiencies.</p>	6	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>6. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This request would result in a decrease in the amount of space on campus after the demolition of A.D. Majors Hall.</p>	10	10
<p>7. The amount of space requested as compared with a program's needs.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The amount of space identified in the program statement has been adequately justified.</p>	5	5
<p>8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This request affects undergraduate instructional and student support space.</p>	5	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Expenditures per gross square foot of state-supported buildings for routine building maintenance at PSC are 18 percent above the median of a national survey of masters/baccalaureate institutions. PSC expended 3.83 percent of its state appropriations and tuition on building maintenance, which represents a tremendous effort to maintain its state-supported facilities with limited available funds.</p>	5	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This request would require additional state resources for facility's operations and maintenance for the addition and air-conditioning of the existing facility.</p>	2	5
TOTAL POINTS	79.0	100
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	79%	

#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. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories. <i>Comments:</i> Programming requests are ranked 5th out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	18	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative." <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable to NCTA projects.</p>	0	0
<p>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices. <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. The immediacy of the need for the project. <i>Comments:</i> This request should be funded in the coming biennium.</p>	9	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <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



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
6. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities.	10	10
7. The amount of space requested as compared with a program's needs. <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.	0	0
8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This proposal affects undergraduate instructional space.	5	5
9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Expenditures per gross square foot of state-supported buildings for routine building maintenance at NCTA are 16 percent below the median of a national survey of associate of arts institutions. However, NCTA expended 6.65 percent of its state appropriations and tuition on building maintenance, which represents a tremendous effort to maintain its state-supported facilities with limited available funds.	5	5
10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> This request will likely require additional state resources for facility's operations and maintenance.	2	5
TOTAL POINTS	67.0	85
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	79%	

#9 CSC / Armstrong P.E. Building Programming



Date of Governing Board Approval: June 10, 2004

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. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Programming requests are ranked 5th out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	18	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The Nebraska State Colleges Board of Trustees designated "upgrading classroom & recreational facilities to meet accreditation standards . . ." and "protecting the investment in facilities and grounds at the State Colleges through . . . orderly planning." as sector initiatives. This project would address these initiatives.</p>	10	10
<p>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices.</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. The immediacy of the need for the project.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project is needed within the next couple of bienniums to begin to further define the buildings needs.</p>	8	10



Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <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
<p>6. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities.</p>	10	10
<p>7. The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs. <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This proposal affects student support space.</p>	5	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Expenditures per gross square foot of state-supported buildings for routine building maintenance at CSC are 26 percent below the median of a national survey of masters institutions. However, CSC expended 2.24 percent of its state appropriations and tuition on building maintenance, which represents a concerted effort to maintain its state-supported facilities with limited available funds.</p>	5	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> This request does not require additional state resources for facility operations and maintenance.</p>	3	5
TOTAL POINTS	73.0	95
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	77%	

#10 LB 309 / Americans with Disabilities Act - Class I Requests



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. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories. <i>Comments:</i> ADA - Class I requests are ranked 3rd out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	24	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative." <i>Comments:</i> This request does not contain a designated sector initiative.</p>	0	10
<p>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of the need for the project. <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. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <i>Comments:</i> Americans with Disabilities Act - Class I requests are awarded eight points for this criterion.</p>	8	10
<p>6. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <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. The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs. <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <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>	4.63	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <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>	4.00	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects should not increase long-term facility operational and maintenance costs at institutions.</p>	3	5
TOTAL POINTS	62.6	85
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	74%	

#11 WSC / Carhart Science Building Renovation & Addition



Date of Governing Board Approval: June 10, 2004
Date of Commission Approval: October 13, 2004
Phasing Considerations: No phasing considerations.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The project includes 59,503 gross square feet (85.86% of project space) of renovation/replacement space which is the 5th ranked statewide facilities category. The remaining 9,802 GSF (14.14% of project space) is new construction which is the 7th ranked statewide facilities category.</p>	17.15	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The Nebraska State Colleges Board of Trustees designated "upgrading classroom & recreational 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 addresses these initiatives.</p>	9.9	10
<p>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices.</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>4. The immediacy of the need for the project.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project is needed within the next couple of bienniums to meet program needs.</p>	8	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</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. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Additional space requested for expanding classroom space does not appear to be supported.</p>	8	10
<p>7. The amount of space requested as compared with a program's needs. <i>Comments:</i> The need for additional classroom space does not appear to be supported by campus utilization information. WSC utilized 46 existing class laboratories an average of 29.9 hours per week in the 1999 fall semester. However, since then, 17 additional classrooms have been brought online with the renovation of Connell Hall. This increase in classrooms will bring the campus average down well below the nationally recognized standard of 30 hours per week for four-year institutions.</p>	3	5
<p>8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This proposal affects undergraduate instructional (79.42%), public service (12.5%), and applied research (8.07%) space.</p>	4.59	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Expenditures per gross square foot of state-supported buildings for routine building maintenance at WSC are 23 percent below the median of a national survey of masters institutions. WSC expended 2.13 percent of its state appropriations and tuition on building maintenance, which is below the 2.2 percent established by the Commission as demonstrating a minimal effort to maintain facilities.</p>	2.5	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> This request requires additional state resources for operations and maintenance of the addition.</p>	2	5
TOTAL POINTS	73.1	100
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	73%	

#11 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>1. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The project includes 21,283 gross square feet (77.73% of project space) of renovation/replacement space which is the 5th ranked statewide facilities category. The remaining 6,096 GSF (22.27% of project space) is new construction which is the 7th ranked statewide facilities category.</p>	16.66	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The Nebraska State Colleges 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/replacement portion of this request addresses this designated sector initiative.</p>	7.77	10
<p>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices.</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>4. The immediacy of the need for the project.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project should be funded in the coming biennium.</p>	9	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</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. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities.</p>	10	10
<p>7. The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs. <i>Comments:</i> The amount of space identified in the program statement has been adequately justified.</p>	5	5
<p>8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This request affects operational support space.</p>	2	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Expenditures per gross square foot of state-supported buildings for routine building maintenance at WSC are 23 percent below the median of a national survey of masters institutions. WSC expended 2.13% of its state appropriations and tuition on building maintenance, which is below the 2.2% established by the Commission as demonstrating a minimal effort to maintain facilities.</p>	2.5	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> This request would require additional state resources for facility’s operations and maintenance of the addition.</p>	2	5
TOTAL POINTS	72.9	100
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	73%	

#13 LB 309 / Energy Conservation - Class I Requests



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. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories. <i>Comments:</i> Energy Conservation - Class I requests are ranked 4th out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	21	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative." <i>Comments:</i> This request does not contain a designated sector initiative.</p>	0	10
<p>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of the need for the project. <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. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <i>Comments:</i> Energy Conservation - Class I requests are awarded seven points for this criterion.</p>	7	10
<p>6. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <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. The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs. <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <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>	4.70	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institutions: CSC, PSC, UNK, UNO, and NCTA. A weighted average of points awarded to each institution was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.26	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <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
TOTAL POINTS	61.0	85
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	72%	

#14 WSC Commons & Street Improvements



Date of Governing Board Approval: June 10, 2004

Date of Commission Approval: July 27, 2004

Phasing Considerations: Phasing of this project will not affect other biennial capital construction budget requests.

Prioritization Criteria Descriptions and Comments	Awarded Points	Maximum Points
<p>1. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project includes both infrastructure repair/replacement (88.67% of project area) which is ranked 5th out of 10 statewide facilities categories, and infrastructure expansion of roads and parking (11.33% of project area) which is 6th ranked statewide facilities category.</p>	17.51	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The Nebraska State Colleges 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>	8.87	10
<p>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The WSC Campus Master Plan approved by the Board of Trustees on April 9, 2002, identified the need to make improvements to the vehicular and pedestrian circulation system on campus. 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. The immediacy of the need for the project.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project is needed within the next five years to correct problems with existing roads.</p>	7	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</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. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities</p>	10	10
<p>7. The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs. <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <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>	4.66	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Expenditures per gross square foot of state-supported buildings for routine building maintenance at WSC are 23 percent below the median of a national survey of masters institutions. WSC expended 2.13% of its state appropriations and tuition on building maintenance, which is below the 2.2% established by the Commission as demonstrating a minimal effort to maintain facilities.</p>	2.5	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> This request should not require additional state resources for facility’s operations and maintenance.</p>	3	5
TOTAL POINTS	67.5	95
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	71%	

#15 PSC / Al Wheeler Activity Center Bleacher Replacement



Date of Governing Board Approval: June 10, 2004

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. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project is similar to Deferred Repair - Class II and III requests which are ranked 7th out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	12	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The Nebraska State Colleges 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. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of the need for the project.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project is needed within the next five years to replace bleachers that are near the end of their useful life.</p>	7	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality.</p> <p><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. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities.</p>	10	10
<p>7. The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs. <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This request will make repairs to a student support facility.</p>	5	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Expenditures per gross square foot of state-supported buildings for routine building maintenance at PSC are 18 percent above the median of a national survey of masters/baccalaureate institutions. PSC expended 3.83 percent of its state appropriations and tuition on building maintenance, which represents a tremendous effort to maintain its state-supported facilities with limited available funds.</p>	5	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> This request does not require additional state resources for facility’s operations and maintenance.</p>	3	5
TOTAL POINTS	56.0	85
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	66%	

#16 LB 309 / Deferred Repair - Classes II & III Requests



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. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories. <i>Comments:</i> Deferred Repair - Class II and III requests are ranked 7th out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	12	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative." <i>Comments:</i> The Nebraska State Colleges 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. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of the need for the project. <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. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <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. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request does not unnecessarily duplicate facilities at these institutions.</p>	10	10
<p>7. The amount of space requested as compared with a program's needs. <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <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>	4.18	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institutions: PSC, WSC, UNK, UNL, UNMC, and UNO. A weighted average of points awarded at each institution was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.67	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects should not increase long-term facility operational and maintenance costs at institutions.</p>	3	5
TOTAL POINTS	54.9	85
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	65%	

#17 LB 309 / Americans with Disabilities Act - Classes II & III Requests



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. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories. <i>Comments:</i> ADA - Class II and III requests are ranked 8th out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	9	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative." <i>Comments:</i> This request does not contain a designated sector initiative.</p>	0	10
<p>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of the need for the project. <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. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <i>Comments:</i> Americans with Disabilities Act - Class II and III requests are awarded three points for this criterion.</p>	3	10
<p>6. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <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. The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs. <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <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>	4.28	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institutions: PSC, UNK, UNL, and UNO. A weighted average of points awarded at each institution was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.58	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects should not increase long-term facility operational and maintenance costs at institutions.</p>	3	5
TOTAL POINTS	39.9	85
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	47%	

#18 LB 309 / Energy Conservation - Classes II & III Requests



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. Ranking the project according to broad statewide facilities categories. <i>Comments:</i> Energy Conservation - Class II and III requests are ranked 9th out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall statewide needs.</p>	6	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative." <i>Comments:</i> This request does not contain a designated sector initiative.</p>	0	10
<p>3. Degree that the project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities planning practices. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of the need for the project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects would reduce energy expenditures. Simple payback for these projects is ten years or longer.</p>	6	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <i>Comments:</i> Energy Conservation - Class II and III requests are awarded two points for this criterion.</p>	2	10
<p>6. Degree that the project demonstrates it is not an unnecessary duplication of facilities. <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. The amount of space requested as compared with a program’s needs. <i>Comments:</i> This criterion is not applicable since this request will not increase building area.</p>	0	0
<p>8. Types of space associated with the project compared with statewide role & mission priorities. <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>	4.74	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institution: PSC, WSC, and UNO. A weighted average of points awarded to each institution was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	2.73	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects will provide some financial payback and are therefore awarded points accordingly.</p>	4	5
TOTAL POINTS	35.5	85
PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS	42%	

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 (the 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.

Appendix A - Definitions



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.