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University of Southern Maine

Presented by:
Sightlines profile

Over 400 campuses across 43 states, Washington DC, and Nova Scotia

Common facilities vocabulary
Consistent analytical methodology
Context through benchmarking
A vocabulary for measurement

The Return on Physical Assets – ROPA<sup>SM</sup>

The annual investment needed to ensure buildings will properly perform and reach their useful life

“Keep-Up Costs”

Annual Stewardship

The accumulated backlog of repair / modernization needs and the definition of resource capacity to correct them

“Catch-Up Costs”

Asset Reinvestment

The effectiveness of the facilities operating budget, staffing, supervision, and energy management

Operational Effectiveness

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

Service

Asset Value Change

Operations Success
## Comparative peer institutions for USM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg State University</td>
<td>Fitchburg, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framingham State University</td>
<td>Framingham, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University of PA</td>
<td>Indiana, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keene State College</td>
<td>Keene, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutztown University of PA</td>
<td>Kutztown, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth State University</td>
<td>Plymouth, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Maine</td>
<td>Orono, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine at Farmington</td>
<td>Farmington, ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Dartmouth</td>
<td>North Dartmouth, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Lowell</td>
<td>Lowell, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Chester University of PA</td>
<td>West Chester, PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparative Considerations

Size, technical complexity, and setting are all factors included in the selection of peer institutions.
Key observations at Southern Maine

Physical Portfolio
• Campus age has shifted dramatically since FY00, however, recent data suggest campus is aging at a swift pace.
• Opportunity exists in buildings over 50 with poor utilization and poor condition.

Asset Value Change
• Capital spending focus has shifted from new space to existing space and the envelope and mechanical needs inside these spaces.
• USM is unable to meet target levels with Annual Stewardship funds alone.
• As a result, backlog of need is growing at a more rapid rate than peers.

Operational Effectiveness
• Planned Maintenance is one of lowest in peer group; implementation of IWMS will increase tracking of Planned Maintenance.
• Energy consumption is among lowest in peer group and continually below peers each year.
Physical Portfolio
Key drivers of facilities metrics

Density aligned with peer group but well below public database
Evolution of building age at Southern Maine

Renos & new space shift age dramatically since FY00, over 50 beginning to grow

Renovation Age Changes Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Under 10</th>
<th>10 to 25</th>
<th>25 to 50</th>
<th>Over 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY00</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USM has a more favorable age distribution

30% of campus in highest risk renovation age category

Campus Age by Category

- **Highest Risk**
  - USM: 30%
  - Peer Average: 13%

- **Medium Risk**
  - USM: 13%
  - Peer Average: 16%

- **Low Risk**
  - USM: 57%
  - Peer Average: 71%

Below are the descriptions of the risk categories:

- **Buildings under 10**: Little work. “Honeymoon” period.
  - Low Risk

- **Buildings 10 to 25**: Short life-cycle needs; primarily space renewal.
  - Medium Risk

- **Buildings 25 to 50**: Major envelope and mechanical life cycles come due.
  - Higher Risk

- **Buildings over 50**: Life cycles of major building components are past due. Failures are possible.
  - Highest risk
Age profile impacts future capital strategy

**Key Questions:**

- How do you address the backlog of needs?
- How do you address the ongoing renewal needs?

**Constructed Space Since 1900**

- **Pre-War** (Built before 1951)
  - Durable construction
  - Older but typically lasts longer

- **Post-War** (Built between 1951 and 1975)
  - Lower-quality construction
  - Already needing more repairs and renovations

- **Modern** (Built between 1975 and 1990)
  - Quick-flash construction
  - Low-quality building components

- **Complex** (Built in 1991 and newer)
  - Technically complex spaces
  - Higher-quality, more expensive to maintain & repair

**43%**

GSF:

- 1900: 0
- 1905: 0
- 1910: 0
- 1915: 0
- 1920: 0
- 1925: 0
- 1930: 0
- 1935: 0
- 1940: 0
- 1945: 0
- 1950: 0
- 1955: 0
- 1960: 0
- 1965: 0
- 1970: 0
- 1975: 0
- 1980: 0
- 1985: 0
- 1990: 0
- 1995: 0
- 2000: 0
- 2005: 0
- 2010: 0
- 2015: 0

- 2020: 50
- 2025: 50
- 2030: 50
- 2035: 50
- 2040: 50
- 2045: 50
- 2050: 50
- 2055: 50
- 2060: 50
- 2065: 50
- 2070: 50
- 2075: 50
- 2080: 50
- 2085: 50
- 2090: 50
- 2095: 50
- 2100: 50
- 2105: 50

**GSF**

- 100,000
- 200,000
- 300,000
- 400,000
- 500,000
- 600,000
- 700,000
## Utilization data collected for all buildings over age 50

Utilization template distributed to, and completed by, each institution in the system.

The following slides will dig deeper into some of the buildings on this list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>Program Use</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Utilization Rate</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Value to Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Glickman Library-Orig</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>110,243</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1: High</td>
<td>1: Excellent Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Robie-Andrews Hall</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>78,122</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1: High</td>
<td>2: Fair Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Bailey Hall</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>73,516</td>
<td>Science Building</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1: High</td>
<td>3: Poor Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Upton-Hastings Hall</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>55,567</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1: High</td>
<td>2: Fair Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Payson Smith Hall</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>52,603</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1: High</td>
<td>2: Fair Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Corthell Hall</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>49,392</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1: High</td>
<td>2: Fair Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Forest Ave-501</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>26,157</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2: Moderate</td>
<td>1: Excellent Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Woodward Hall</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>20,709</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1: High</td>
<td>2: Fair Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Russell Hall</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>18,764</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1: High</td>
<td>2: Fair Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Stone House</td>
<td>Freeport</td>
<td>15,177</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3: Low</td>
<td>3: Poor Condition</td>
<td>2: Moderately Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Admissions-Phinney House</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>10,811</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1: High</td>
<td>2: Fair Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Presidents Hse-USM</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>10,528</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3: Low</td>
<td>2: Fair Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Bedford St-025, Facmgt</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>9,722</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1: High</td>
<td>1: Excellent Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>College Ave-051</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>9,622</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2: Moderate</td>
<td>2: Fair Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>School St-128</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>8,546</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2: Moderate</td>
<td>2: Fair Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>McEllan House</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>7,423</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3: Low</td>
<td>3: Poor Condition</td>
<td>2: Moderately Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>Academy Bldg</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>7,203</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1: High</td>
<td>3: Poor Condition</td>
<td>1: Valuable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyzing highest risk space at USM

Strategies should focus on buildings with poor condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name:</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>GSF:</th>
<th>Utilization Rate:</th>
<th>Condition:</th>
<th>Value to Program:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robie-Andrews Hall</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>78,122</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Hall</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>73,516</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton-Hastings Hall</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>55,567</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corthell Hall</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>49,392</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward Hall</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>20,709</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Hall</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>18,764</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions-Phinney House</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>10,811</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents Hse-USM</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>10,528</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLellan House</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>7,423</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Moderately Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy Bldg</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>7,203</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain Ave-001</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>5,557</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderately Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Ave-019</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>4,109</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderately Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deering Ave-222</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Moderately Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain Ave-011</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>3,133</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderately Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farmhouse</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Moderately Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain Ave-019</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderately Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite St-011</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Of Little or No Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Making Studio</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Match needs to building condition

USM facilities over 50 years old

Building vs. Utilization

High

Academy Building
Bailey Hall

Admissions - Phinney House
Corthell Hall
Payson Smith Hall
Robie-Andrews Hall
Russell Hall
Upton-Hastings Hall
Woodward Hall

Bedford St – 025, Fac. Mgmt.
Glickman Library

Bedford St – 092
Bedford St – 094
Bedford St – 098
Bedford St – 102
Bedford St – 106
Bedford St – 118
Bedford St – 120
Bedford St – 126
College Ave – 051
Deering Ave – 228
Exeter St – 045
Exeter St – 047
Exeter St – 049-051
Exeter St – 059-061
Exeter St – 063-065
School St – 062, 128

Moderate

Art Gallery

Bedford St – 095
Bedford St – 104
Bedford St – 107
Bedford St – 110
Bedford St – 113
Exeter St – 054
Forest Ave - 501

Low

The Farmhouse
Deering Ave – 222
Granite St – 011
McLellan House
Stone House

Chamberlain Ave – 001
Chamberlain Ave – 011
Chamberlain Ave – 019
College Ave – 019
Presidents House
Print Making Studio

Bedford St – 095
Bedford St – 104
Bedford St – 107
Bedford St – 110
Bedford St – 113
Exeter St – 054
Forest Ave - 501

Condition of Buildings

Poor
Fair
Excellent
### Identifying spaces worth addressing

**Focus investments on highly utilized space with the most need**

#### Building vs. Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Utilization Rate</th>
<th>Moderate Utilization Rate</th>
<th>Low Utilization Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academy Building</strong></td>
<td><strong>Art Gallery</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Farmhouse</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deering Ave – 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,719 GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Granite St – 011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McLellan House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stone House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,960 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions - Phinney House Corthell Hall Payson Smith Hall Robie-Andrews Hall Russell Hall Upton-Hastings Hall Woodward Hall</td>
<td>Bedford St – 092 College Ave – 051</td>
<td>Bedford St – 098 Exeter St – 045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bedford St – 102 Exeter St – 047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bedford St – 106 Exeter St – 049-051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bedford St – 118 Exeter St – 059-061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bedford St – 120 Exeter St – 063-065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bedford St – 126 School St – 062, 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exeter St – 055 Forest Ave - 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exeter St – 039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Condition of Buildings

- Poor
- Fair
- Excellent
How campus change impacts operations

Loss of 7 poor condition, low utilization USM facilities
Asset Value Change
Focus shifts from New Space to Existing Space

Total FY13 investment = $8.7M

Capital Project Spending

- FY06: $1M (Existing Space), $3M (New Space), $0 (Non-Facilities)
- FY07: $25M (Existing Space), $22M (New Space), $0 (Non-Facilities)
- FY08: $20M (Existing Space), $10M (New Space), $0 (Non-Facilities)
- FY09: $10M (Existing Space), $5M (New Space), $0 (Non-Facilities)
- FY10: $5M (Existing Space), $2.5M (New Space), $0.5M (Non-Facilities)
- FY11: $12M (Existing Space), $6M (New Space), $0.5M (Non-Facilities)
- FY12: $15M (Existing Space), $7.5M (New Space), $0.5M (Non-Facilities)
- FY13: $15M (Existing Space), $7.5M (New Space), $0.5M (Non-Facilities)

Total Project Spending Average: $13.0M
Focus shifts from New Space to Existing Space

Total FY13 investment = $8.7M

Capital Project Spending

Total Project Spending Average: $13.0M

Existing Space | New Space | Non-Facilities
Focus shifts from New Space to Existing Space

Total FY13 investment = $8.7M

Capital Project Spending

Millions

Existing Space Average: $4.5M

Existing Space

FY06 FY07 FY08 FY09 FY10 FY11 FY12 FY13
Project spending at USM is volatile

Historic focus on new construction results in “Catch Up” of existing space

An additional $9M annually would bring USM to peer average
Similar investment profile at USM and peers

Peer Project Breakout
FY06 – FY13

- Envelope: 32%
- Building Systems: 18%
- Infrastructure: 12%
- Space Renewal: 7%
- Safety/Code: 3%

USM Project Breakout
FY06 – FY13

- Envelope: 37%
- Building Systems: 26%
- Infrastructure: 17%
- Space Renewal: 17%
- Safety/Code: 3%
Defining stewardship investment targets

What is the right investment level for Southern Maine?

- **Discounts for campus modernization and replacement of components before life cycles come due**: $7.0M
- **Functional Obsolescence (Target)**: $3.5M
- **Life Cycle Need (Equilibrium)**: $6.5M
- **3% Replacement Value**: $17.7M

Replacement Value: $590.6M

**Target Need**: Discounts for campus modernization and replacement of components before life cycles come due.
USM lacks dependable sources of Stewardship

Southern Maine is unable to “Keep-Up” with renewal needs

Stabilizing Backlog

Total Deferment $57M

Increasing Backlog

Millions

$16.0
$14.0
$12.0
$10.0
$8.0
$6.0
$4.0
$2.0
$0.0

2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013

Annual Stewardship
Target Need
Breaking out the Target investment level

Despite not hitting target, USM allocates AS funds towards durable projects

**Envelope/Mechanical Investment**

- $4.4M

**Space/Program Investment**

- $3.1M
Annual Stewardship as a percent of target

Peers come closer to meeting target needs each year than USM
One-Time funds help bring USM closer to targets

Exceeding target and life cycle needs once in 8 years
USM shifts focus to secure key building components

Mix of spending further suggests USM is in a period of “catching up”

*includes AS and AR Funds
Backlog growing more rapidly than peers

Total backlog of need exceeds $225M in FY13
Growing backlog decreases NAV

Net Asset Value at USM in the Systemic Renovation stage

**Net Asset Value Index**

\[ \text{NAV Index} = \frac{\text{Replacement Value} - \text{Building Needs}}{\text{Replacement Value}} \times 100 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Upkeep stage:</th>
<th>Primarily new or recently renovated buildings with sporadic building repair &amp; life cycle needs; “You pick the projects”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repair and Maintain stage:</td>
<td>Buildings are beginning to show their age and may require more significant investment on a case-by-case basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic Renovation stage:</td>
<td>Buildings may require more significant repairs; large capital infusions; “The projects pick you”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional/Gut Renovation/Demo stage:</td>
<td>Major buildings components are in jeopardy of failure. Reliability issues are widespread throughout the building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Operations
Overall operating levels below peer average

FY13 expenditures $1/GSF below peer levels
Daily Service reaches peer average in FY13

Daily service appears to stabilize from FY12 to FY13

---

**Total Daily Service**

- $6.00
- $5.00
- $4.00
- $3.00
- $2.00
- $1.00
- $0.00

**Daily Service Actuals**

- $7.00
- $6.00
- $5.00
- $4.00
- $3.00
- $2.00
- $1.00
- $0.00

Bar charts showing comparison between Peer Average and USM Average from FY06 to FY13.
PM among lowest in peer group

Implementation of IWMS will increase tracking of Planned Maintenance

- **Total Planned Maintenance**

  - $0.35
  - $0.30
  - $0.25
  - $0.20
  - $0.15
  - $0.10
  - $0.05
  - $0.00

- **Peer Average**
- **USM Average**
Custodial & Maintenance staff cover more space

Urban setting presents more challenging grounds care

Institutions Ordered By: Tech Rating
Institutions Ordered By: Density Factor
Institutions Ordered By: Grounds Intensity

Peer Average
Heavier sup. lessens strain of higher coverage on GSF/FTE
Fewer resources for staff

Limited material spending impacts inspection scores across the board
Consumption among lowest in peer group

USM benefits from lower unit costs compared to peers

Energy Consumption

Energy Unit Cost By Fuel

Peer Average  Fossil  Electric
Energy conservation continues to be a highlight

USM has decreased consumption by 11% since peak in FY08

Energy Peers: Fitchburg State University, Framingham State University, Keene State College, Mount Holyoke College, Plymouth State University, The University of Maine, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, Worcester State University
Age of campus plays important role in inspection

Pockets of opportunity exist at USM
Concluding Comments for Southern Maine

Physical Portfolio
- USM’s density calculation suggest some flexibility in addressing buildings over 50 with poor condition and low utilization. USM should consider renovating spaces with high utilization and poor condition.
- Buildings under 25 have ongoing renewal needs that if addressed through PM and recurring funds on an annual basis can extend the useful life of costly building components.

Asset Value Change
- Due to large investments into new construction from FY06-FY09 USM is in a period of “Catch-Up” where Annual Stewardship funds are playing dual roles.
- Growing the Annual Stewardship funds to address the ongoing renewal or “Keep-Up” needs of buildings will be critical to ensure buildings run at peak performance.

Operational Effectiveness
- Implementation of the IWM system will provide USM the tools to track and grow the internal Planned Maintenance program. This data will be helpful in understanding the different needs of buildings and assist in future project selections.
- Continuing to reduce energy consumption will increase cost savings that should be recycled back into the operating budget for PM work.
Questions & Comments