

Capital Construction Budget Recommendations and Prioritization 2015-2017 Biennium

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

Approved by the Commission
October 14, 2014

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: www.ccpe.ne.gov

Commissioners

Ms. Colleen Adam, Chair (*Hastings*)

Ms. Carol A. Zink, Vice Chair (*Lincoln*)

Dr. John Bernthal (*Lincoln*)

Ms. Mary Lauritzen (*West Point*)

Dr. Joyce D. Simmons (*Valentine*)

Dr. Deborah A. Frison (*Omaha*)

Mr. Dwayne Probyn (*Papillion*)

Ms. Lori Warner (*South Sioux City*)

Dr. Ronald Hunter (*Hay Spring*)

Mr. Eric Seacrest (*North Platte*)

Mr. William "Scott" Wilson (*Papillion*)

Dr. Michael Baumgartner, Executive Director

This report and all other reports are available online at www.ccpe.ne.gov.

The Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age or disability in the employment or the provision of services.

Table of Contents




Executive Summary	Page iii
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 2015-2017 Biennium	Page III – 1
Section IV - Commission's Capital Construction Budget Recommendations 2015-2017 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 – 6
Priority # 2 – LB 309 Deferred Repair - Class I Requests	Page V – 8
Priority # 3 – CSC Math Science Renovation/Addition	Page V–10
Priority # 4 – LB 309 Energy Conservation - Class I Requests	Page V–12
Priority # 5 – LB 309 Americans with Disabilities Act - Class I Requests	Page V–14
Priority # 6 – WSC Industrial Technology Facility Planning.....	Page V–16
Priority # 6 – PSC Theatre Renovation Planning.....	Page V–18
Priority # 8 – LB 309 Fire & Life Safety - Class II Requests	Page V–20

Table of Contents



Priority # 9 – NSCS Energy Master Plan	Page V–22
Priority #10 – LB 309 Deferred Repair - Class II Requests	Page V–24
Priority #11 – LB 309 Energy Conservation - Class II Requests	Page V–26
Priority #12 – PSC Biomass Energy Center	Page V–28
Priority #13 – LB 309 Americans with Disabilities Act - Class II Requests	Page V–30
Appendix A - Institution Routine Facility Maintenance Expenditures	Page A – 1
Appendix B - Institution Deferred Repair Expenditures	Page B – 1
Appendix C - Definitions	Page C – 1

Executive Summary




The Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education provides funding and priority recommendations for the Nebraska State College's, the University of Nebraska's and the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture at Curtis' capital construction requests, as outlined in Nebraska's Constitution and Statutes. The overarching principle used in this process is to provide safe, functional, well-utilized and well-maintained facilities that support institutional efforts to provide exemplary programs.


The Commission places fire & life safety as its highest priority, followed by the completion of partially funded projects, and adequate funding of ongoing and continued upkeep of existing State-supported facilities (valued at \$3.1 billion in 2013). To adequately fund the upkeep of existing facilities, the Commission has identified ongoing routine maintenance and addressing deferred repair as two essential areas in need of new State and institutional funding during the next biennium.

- **Ongoing Routine Maintenance** – Additional funding is needed to provide systematic day-to-day maintenance to prevent or control the rate of deterioration of facilities. This work is funded from institutional operating budgets, with each campus controlling the amount of building maintenance funds expended. The type of work associated with ongoing routine maintenance includes preventive maintenance, minor repairs and routine inspections to building systems. Consistent with nationally recognized standards, the Commission recommends annual funding for routine maintenance of facilities between 1% and 1.5% of facility

replacement values (\$31 million to \$46 million per year). Combined University and State College annual expenditures for routine maintenance averaged 0.65% of State-supported facilities' replacement values during the 2011-2013 biennium (\$19.3 million per year). The following chart shows the trend in institutional routine maintenance expenditures for the past 10 years. The trend indicates a gradual decline in overall and University routine maintenance expenditures as a percentage of their State-supported facilities' current replacement value (CRV).




Executive Summary



It is critical for the long-term stewardship of these facilities to continue to provide a significant amount of ongoing State support to operate and maintain approved capital construction projects. Institutions must also place an appropriate priority to adequately fund building maintenance in their operating budgets. A lack of adequate routine maintenance accelerates taxpayers' obligations to fund deferred repair and renovation needs in the future. Reinstating State appropriations for approved new building operations and maintenance (O&M) requests would help support institutional routine maintenance budgets.

- **Addressing Deferred Repair** – This work addresses major repair and replacement of building systems needed to keep a facility usable. Work includes such items as roof replacement, masonry tuck-pointing, window and mechanical system replacement. Institutions do not normally finance these larger projects through their annual operating budget. However, institutions have used operating funds to match Building Renewal Allocation Funds and to address some of their more urgent repair needs. Recommended annual funding for addressing University and State College deferred repair needs is between 0.5% and 1% of facilities' replacement values (\$15 million to \$31 million per year). Actual LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal allocations and institutional deferred repair expenditures for State-supported facilities averaged \$9.2 million per year (0.3% of facility replacement values) during the 2011-2013 biennium. The following chart shows the trend in addressing University and State College deferred repair expenditures for the past 10 years. The trend indicates a decline in expenditures for


addressing deferred repair as a percentage of State-supported facilities' CRV.




The Commission supports an increase in the Building Renewal Allocation Fund's \$9,163,000 annual appropriation, (last increased in 2002) by at least \$9 million annually to account for a near doubling of costs due to inflation and increased State-supported building area.

- **Renovation/Remodeling** – Aging building systems will eventually result in the need to renovate a facility. Programmatic changes can also create the need for

Executive Summary



remodeling. Recommended annual funding for University and State College renovation/remodeling is between 0.5% and 1.5% of facility replacement values (\$15 million to \$46 million per year). Actual renovation/remodeling expenditures of State-supported facilities averaged \$55.2 million per year (1.85% of the replacement value) during the 2011-2013 biennium. Funding sources include: State appropriations; institutional operating budget expenditures; federal grants; private donations; and student tuition and fees. The following chart shows the trend in institutional renovation/remodeling expenditures for the past 10 years. The trend indicates an increase in renovation/remodeling expenditures as a percentage of State-supported facilities' CRV.



Section I of the report provides additional detail regarding ongoing routine maintenance, addressing deferred repair and renovation/remodeling needs at the State Colleges and University.

The Commission recommends continued reaffirmation funding of all partially funded capital construction projects as outlined in Section II.


The Commission's funding recommendations are provided in Section IV of the report, including recommended funding modifications to seven capital construction requests.

The Commission prioritized 13 approved capital construction requests for the 2015-2017 biennium. The Commission's prioritized list is aimed at identifying from a statewide perspective the most urgent capital construction needs for the coming biennium. The prioritization is designed to assist the Governor and Legislature in developing a strategy to address the most critical institutional facility needs from a statewide perspective.

The Commission uses 10 weighted criteria to prioritize individual capital construction project requests. The percentage resulting from these criteria's cumulative point total establishes the recommended statewide funding order of capital projects. In developing the prioritization process, a primary goal of the Commission is to protect building occupants, complete partially funded projects and prevent further deterioration of the State's existing physical assets.

The following list shows approved capital construction project requests in priority order with the amount of State tax

Executive Summary



funds recommended. Section V of the report provides additional detail on the prioritization process and the individual points assigned to each request.


- #1 LB 309 Fire and Life Safety - Class I Requests (\$12.8 million in Building Renewal Allocation Funds)
- #2 LB 309 Deferred Repair - Class I Requests (\$21.0 million in Building Renewal Allocation Funds. A substantial inflationary increase in appropriation is needed to meet these needs.)
- #3 CSC Math Science Building Renovation/Addition (\$15.83 million appropriation from State General Funds in the 2015-17 biennium. By fully funding the renovation with State appropriations, the LB 309 Task Force would have additional funds available for its many other unmet needs. An additional \$5.45 million appropriation would be needed in FY 2018 to complete the project.)
- #4 LB 309 Energy Conservation - Class I Requests (\$2.7 million Building Renewal Allocation Funds. A substantial inflationary increase in appropriation is needed to meet these needs.)
- #5 LB 309 Americans with Disabilities Act - Class I Requests (\$546,000 in Building Renewal Allocation Funds. A substantial inflationary increase in appropriation is needed to meet these needs.)
- #6 (tie) WSC Industrial Technology Facilities Planning (\$77,000 in State tax appropriations for planning is

recommended. Funding for design beyond the programming stage is not recommended until the Commission has reviewed and approved a program statement.)

- #6 (tie) PSC Theatre Renovation Planning (\$70,000 in State tax appropriations)
- #8 LB 309 Fire and Life Safety - Class II Requests (\$1.27 million in Building Renewal Allocation Funds)
- #9 NSCS Sustainable Practices & Renewable Energy Master Plan (\$75,000 in State tax appropriations)
- #10 LB 309 Deferred Repair - Class II Requests (Insufficient Building Renewal Allocation Funds to address these needs)
- #11 LB 309 Energy Conservation - Class II Requests (Insufficient Building Renewal Allocation Funds to address these needs)
- #12 PSC Biomass Energy Center (\$75,000 in State tax appropriations for a revised planning document. Funding beyond the programming stage is not recommended until the Commission has reviewed and approved a revised program statement.)
- #13 LB 309 Americans with Disabilities Act - Class II Requests (Insufficient Building Renewal Allocation Funds to address these needs)

*Section I -
Introduction and Statewide
Facilities Funding Issues*

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



Introduction

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 2015-2017 biennium.

Constitutional and Statutory Reference

In creating the Coordinating Commission, Nebraska residents voted to assign the following responsibilities for coordination per the Constitution of Nebraska, [Article VII, Section 14](#):

“Coordination shall mean:


(1) Authority to adopt, and revise as needed, a comprehensive statewide plan for postsecondary education which shall include (a) definitions of the role and mission of each public postsecondary educational institution within any general assignments of role and mission as may be prescribed by the Legislature and (b) plans for facilities which utilize tax funds designated by the Legislature;

(2) Authority to review, monitor, and approve or disapprove each public postsecondary educational institution's programs and capital construction projects which utilize tax funds designated by the Legislature in order to provide compliance and consistency with the comprehensive plan and to prevent unnecessary duplication; and

(3) Authority to review and modify, if needed to promote compliance and consistency with the comprehensive statewide plan and prevent unnecessary duplication, the budget requests of the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska, the Board of Trustees of the Nebraska State Colleges, any board or boards established for the community colleges, or any other governing board for any other public postsecondary educational institution which may be established by the Legislature.”

The Legislature further defined the Commission's responsibilities regarding review of public postsecondary education budget requests per Nebraska Revised Statutes, Section [85-1416 \(3\)](#), which states: “At least thirty days prior to submitting to the Governor their biennial budget requests pursuant to section [81-1113](#) and any major deficit appropriation requests pursuant to instructions of the Department of Administrative Services,

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



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](#). The recommendations submitted to the Legislature shall be submitted electronically. 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. The prioritization submitted to the Legislature shall be submitted electronically. In establishing its prioritized list, the commission may consider and respond to the priority order established by the Board of Regents or the Board of Trustees in their respective capital construction budget requests.”


Statewide Facilities Plan: Goals & Strategies

Of the physical assets supported by State government, a high proportion is found on the campuses of public higher education institutions throughout Nebraska. To protect this considerable investment (\$3.1 billion in 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 responsibility for statewide comprehensive planning for postsecondary education. Nebraska’s *Comprehensive Statewide Plan for Postsecondary Education* identifies 14 major statewide goals and strategies. These 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

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



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:

- **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.**

Approved 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 both initial construction and ongoing operations and maintenance of new and existing facilities.


The Commission has identified ongoing routine maintenance and deferred repair as two essential areas in which State and institutional funding are needed during the next biennium. Adequate funding in these areas would provide long-term cost savings and further enhance Nebraska’s higher education system.

Financing Facility Renewal and Adaptation


State-supported facilities provide a foundation for many functions important to the residents of our state, including public postsecondary education. These facilities represent an enormous investment over the years by Nebraska taxpayers (currently valued at \$3.1 billion in 2013). However, these assets deteriorate over time. Weather, use, obsolescence and changing needs all play a part in this deterioration.

To prevent our higher education facilities from aging too quickly, the Commission continues to advocate 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 facilities are

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



ongoing routine maintenance, deferred repair and renovation/remodeling.



Ongoing Routine Maintenance – Funding is needed to provide systematic day-to-day maintenance to prevent or control the rate of deterioration of facilities. This work is funded from institutional operating budgets, with each campus controlling the amount of building maintenance funds expended. The type of work associated with ongoing routine maintenance includes preventive


maintenance, minor repairs and routine inspections to each building system, including roofs, exterior envelope, elevators, HVAC systems, etc. Routine maintenance is similar to washing off road salt, changing the oil, checking tire pressure and providing tune-ups for a car on a regular basis. These expenditures reduce wear and extend the life of the facility.

Consistent with nationally recognized standards, the Commission recommends that annual funding for routine maintenance of facilities be between 1% and 1.5% of facility replacement values. This would amount to between \$31 million and \$46 million per year at our public four-year postsecondary educational institutions.

Actual combined University and State College annual funding for routine maintenance averaged 0.65% of State-supported facilities' replacement values during the 2011-2013 biennium. This represents a similar low level reported the prior biennium. The combined dollar amount allocated by the University, State Colleges and NCTA for routine maintenance averaged \$19.3 million per year during the 2011-2013 biennium.


The chart on the following page shows the trend in institutional routine maintenance expenditures for the past

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



10 years. The trend indicates a gradual decline in overall expenditures for routine maintenance as a percent of State-supported facilities' current replacement value (CRV) for our public postsecondary institutions. The Nebraska State Colleges have shown an overall increase in spending for ongoing routine maintenance that is well within the recommended range of expenditures. However, the University of Nebraska has decreased ongoing routine maintenance expenditures over the last 10 years and is well below recommended levels of expenditures.


The State Colleges annual routine maintenance expenditures averaged 1.3% of State-supported facilities' replacement values during the 2011-2013 biennium (see Appendix A). The combined dollar amount allocated by the State Colleges for routine maintenance averaged \$3.0 million per year during that time. Annual routine maintenance expenditures for all three State Colleges exceeded the minimum recommendation of 1% of State-supported facilities' replacement values during the biennium.



The University's annual routine maintenance expenditures averaged 0.6% of State-supported facilities' replacement values during the 2011-2013 biennium (see Appendix A). The combined annual University allocation for routine maintenance averaged \$16.1 million during the biennium. No University of Nebraska institution had annual routine maintenance expenditures that averaged more than the minimum recommendation of 1% of State-supported facilities' replacement values during the biennium. UNK, UNL and UNO had annual routine maintenance expenditures that averaged half or less than the recommended minimum level.

NCTA's annual routine maintenance expenditures averaged 0.6% of State-supported facilities' replacement

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



values during the 2011-2013 biennium (see Appendix A). NCTA's average annual allocation for routine maintenance was \$168,900 during the biennium.

Prior to the 2007-2009 biennium, the State provided increased appropriations for ongoing facilities operating and maintenance costs associated with new building openings. With the exception of the South Sioux City Center, increased State appropriations for facility operating and maintenance (O&M) requests have not been provided since the 2005-2007 biennium. This is likely one of the factors contributing to low routine maintenance expenditures. It is critical for the long-term stewardship of these facilities to continue to provide a significant amount of ongoing State support for approved capital construction projects.


Campus funding priorities are another contributing factor. The Commission recommends that University campuses increase allocations of operating funds for ongoing routine maintenance. This would include utilizing a portion of the Facilities and Administrative (F&A) cost reimbursement from federal grant funds. A lack of adequate routine maintenance accelerates taxpayers'

obligations to fund deferred repair and renovation needs in the future.

Addressing Deferred Repair – This work comprises major repair and replacement of building systems needed for continued use of a facility. Work includes such items as roof replacement, masonry tuck-pointing and window replacement. These items are not normally contained in an annual operating budget. However, institutions have been using operating funds to match Building Renewal Allocation Funds and to address some of their more urgent repair needs.

Recommended annual funding for addressing deferred repair of facilities is between 0.5% and 1% of facilities' replacement values (between \$15 million and \$31 million per year). During the 2011-2013 biennium, the LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal allocated nearly \$5.0 million per year (averaging over 0.15% of facility replacement values per year) to address deferred repair needs at State College, University and NCTA State-supported facilities. University and State College operating budget expenditures averaged an additional \$4.2 million per year for cooperative funding and addressing deferred repair projects (averaging nearly 0.15% of the


Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



replacement value of their State-supported facilities). Additional detail on institutional deferred repair expenditures is located in Appendix B.

Together, the Task Force for Building Renewal and our public institutions have averaged annual funding equal to 0.3% of State-supported facilities' replacement values for addressing deferred repairs needs during the 2011-2013 biennium.


The following chart shows the trend in addressing deferred repair for the past 10 years. The trend indicates a decline in expenditures for addressing deferred repair as a percent of institutional State-supported facilities' current replacement value (CRV). This decline is due in part to flat appropriations to the Building Renewal Allocation Fund and institutions that have not kept up with rising inflationary costs.



Options to consider for increasing deferred repair funding include:

- Increasing the annual appropriation to the Building Renewal Allocation Fund from \$9.163 million per year to a minimum of \$18 million per year to account for inflationary costs that have nearly doubled since 2002, which is the last year that these funds were increased. It should be noted that the value of State-supported public postsecondary facilities for which

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



LB 309 Task Force and institutions are responsible, has increased from \$1.6 billion to \$3.1 billion over these 12 years.

- Reestablishing the depreciation charge beginning with a 1% annual charge on the cost of newly constructed, acquired or renovated facilities. This would be an initial step toward fully requiring and funding the needed 2% depreciation charge for a University Building Renewal Assessment Fund and State College Building Renewal Assessment Fund.
- Establishing a public postsecondary education deferred repair fund financed by an annual fee on State-supported facilities. The fee could be based on either square footage or replacement cost of a facility.

The goal of increased funding should be to slow the growth of the deferred repair backlog at University and State College campuses.


Renovation/Remodeling – Aging building systems will eventually result in the need to renovate a facility. Programmatic changes can also create the need for remodeling. Renovations will generally include deferred repair work to bring a facility up to a new and more functional condition. Renovations and remodeling provide

institutions with modern, flexible and functional facilities designed to meet the needs of students, faculty and staff.

Recommended annual funding for renovation and remodeling is between 0.5% and 1.5% of facility replacement values (between \$15 million and \$46 million per year). Renovation and remodeling funding during the 2011-2013 biennium averaged \$55.2 million per year (1.85% of the replacement value of University and State Colleges' State-supported facilities). Funding sources for renovation and remodeling include: State appropriations and tuition surcharges for the LB 605 renovation and deferred repair initiative (additional information regarding LB 605 is provided on page IV-8 and at the end of Section IV); University Building Renewal Assessment Fund and State College Building Renewal Assessment Fund allocations (likely ending after the current biennium); State appropriations for the PSC Oak Bowl renovation; institutional operating budget expenditures; federal grants; student capital improvement fees; and private donations.


The chart on the following page shows the trend in institutional renovation/remodeling expenditures for the past 10 years. The trend indicates an increase in expenditures for renovation/remodeling as a percentage of

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



State-supported facilities' current replacement value (CRV). While State appropriations and student tuition and fees provided a majority of the funding for renovation/remodeling, both federal grants associated with the stimulus and private donations contributed substantially to this increase.

(institutions, Commission, Governor and Legislature) take into account an institution's level of routine maintenance and the level of statewide deferred repair funding prior to considering additional appropriations for renovation/remodeling projects.





Total Facility Renewal and Adaptation Funding –

Recommended total annual funding for facility renewal and adaptation (ongoing routine maintenance, deferred repair and renovation/remodeling) for all University and State College State-supported facilities is between 2.0% and 4.0% of facility replacement values (between \$61 million and \$122 million per year). Facility renewal and adaptation funding during the 2011-2013 biennium averaged \$83.8 million per year (2.8% of State-supported facilities' replacement value).

The Commission recommends continued reaffirmation funding of any previously authorized renovation work. The Commission also recommends that all stakeholders

The following chart shows a 10-year trend for average annual total facilities renewal and adaptation expenditures as a percent of State-supported facilities' current replacement value (CRV). The trend indicates level to slowly rising expenditures that are within the recommended funding range. Increased spending on renovation/remodeling have offset reductions in ongoing routine maintenance and deferred repair expenditures.

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues




Funding Strategies – The table at the end of this section provides a summary of the facility renewal and adaptation needs for the Nebraska State College System, University of Nebraska and the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture. This table outlines recommended funding levels, existing expenditures, along with mid-term and long-term goals for funding routine maintenance, deferred repair and renovation/remodeling.

To fully address these needs, a partnership among postsecondary education institutions, the LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal, and Executive and Legislative branches of State government is necessary. Each partner has an interest in seeing institutional assets adequately maintained and adapted to meet the changing needs of students, faculty, staff and the public’s 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 the increasingly competitive atmosphere of retaining and recruiting students. Adequate and well-maintained facilities serve as an important tool for meeting this goal. Institutions must resist the temptation to reduce ongoing building maintenance to address budget shortfalls or reallocations. The Legislature should also restore funding for new building operations and maintenance (O&M) requests (as approved by the Commission if applicable).

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

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



deteriorating at a rate faster than normal by making them weather tight. There is still much work to do to renew Nebraska's public facilities. After 12 years of flat State appropriation levels, inflation has steadily eroded the Building Renewal Allocation Fund and its ability to address its statutory needs. By increasing funding for the Building Renewal Allocation Fund, the LB 309 Task Force could restore its ability to adequately address fire and life safety, deferred repair, the Americans with Disabilities Act and energy conservation needs.

Nebraska Governors and Legislators have demonstrated great forethought over the decades in finding solutions to maintain and support Nebraska's institutions so they may excel in their missions. This partnership with our institutions has brought many successes, including creation of the Task Force for Building Renewal, establishing a depreciation fund and funding major renovation and deferred repair bond initiatives.

In 1998 and 2006, the Governor and Legislature passed LB 1100 and LB 605, respectively. Those bills provided State appropriations, along with matching institutional funding, for dozens of University and State College renovation and deferred repair projects. Total

State and institutional funding for these two bond issues will exceed \$410 million through FY 2020.


In addition, LB 1100 created an annual 2% depreciation charge (repealed by the Legislature per LB 380, 2011) that was assessed on all new construction, renovations or acquisitions. The intent of the depreciation charge was to set aside funding for future institutional facility renewal and renovation work. The final allocations from remaining depreciation funds will likely occur in the current biennium.

Over the past six years, Nebraska's economy and State support for public postsecondary education has fared extremely well compared to other states. Overall stable funding for capital construction has helped to maintain reasonably safe and well-constructed facilities at our public postsecondary educational institutions.

Recommendations

In order to continue this level of service, the Commission recommends four initiatives for the coming biennium: First, reinstate State appropriations for new building operations and maintenance (O&M) requests for approved projects in order to support institutional routine maintenance budgets. Second, increase institutional


Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



outlays for ongoing routine building maintenance to recommended expenditures, including utilizing a portion of Facilities and Administrative (F&A) cost reimbursement from federal grant funds. Third, increase the level of funding to the Building Renewal Allocation Fund, which has not kept up with inflation. Fourth, reinstate the depreciation charge used to support the University Building Renewal Assessment Fund and the State College Building Renewal Assessment Fund to provide a long-term solution to address institutional deferred repair and renovation/remodeling needs.

Continued adequate facility renewal and adaptation funding will support the gains made over the past two decades in improving the condition of institutional facilities. Adequate facilities play an important role in the success of higher education and, in turn, to improving Nebraska's economy and way of life.

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



Facility Renewal and Adaptation Needs at the Nebraska State College System, University of Nebraska & Nebraska College of Tech. Agric.

	Facility Maintenance Expenditures			Annual Funding Facility Maint. & Renov./Remodel
	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 institutional 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>0.5% to 1.5% of replacement value</i>	<i>2% to 4% of replacement value</i>
<i>2011-2013 Expenditures:</i>	<i>0.65% of replacement value</i>	<i>LB309 - 0.15% & Inst. - 0.15% of replacement value</i>	<i>1.85% of replacement value</i>	<i>2.8% of replacement value</i>
<i>Mid-term Goal:</i>	<i>1.0% of replacement value</i>	<i>0.5% of replacement value</i>	<i>1.5% of replacement value</i>	<i>3.0% of replacement value</i>
<i>Long-term Solution:</i>	<i>1.25% of replacement value</i>	<i>2% depreciation charge³</i>		<i>3.25% of replacement value</i>

¹ Source: Financial Planning Guidelines for Facility Renewal and Adaption, 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 Replacement value for the Nebraska State College System, the University of Nebraska, and the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture State-supported facilities is estimated at \$3.1 billion in 2013 dollars.


³ LB 1100, enacted into law in 1998, required all capital construction projects (excluding revenue bond facilities) to be assessed an annual 2% depreciation charge. Funds accumulated with the depreciation charge were used for building renewal and renovation/remodeling work. LB1100 assessments were repealed by the Legislature per LB 380, 2011.

Section I - Introduction & Statewide Facilities Funding Issues



Section II - Existing Commitments

Section II - Existing Commitments



The Nebraska State Colleges, University of Nebraska and Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture have a total of eight reaffirmation funding requests for the 2015-2017 biennium. Previous Legislative appropriations partially funded these requests and additional funding is necessary to continue and/or complete financing.

The Nebraska State College System and University of Nebraska have each included reaffirmation requests for the LB 605 renovation/replacement/repair initiative that involved multiple projects financed with long-term bonds. The Nebraska State College System has also included a reaffirmation request for the LB 1100 renovation/replacement/repair initiative that involved multiple projects financed with long-term bonds. Bond payments are scheduled through FY 2020.

The Nebraska State College System is also requesting reaffirmation of legislation that transfers \$400,000 from the Civic and Community Center Financing Fund to the State Colleges Sport Facilities Cash Fund each year beginning October 1, 2016. A portion of select sales tax purchases go into this fund, of which the Nebraska State College System receives a portion.


Chadron State College, Wayne State College, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, University of Nebraska Medical Center and Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture are also requesting reaffirmation funding to continue bond financing of individual capital construction projects.

Reaffirmation requests for the 2015-2017 biennium totaling \$76,275,550 require a reaffirmation vote of the Legislature and approval of the Governor before State appropriations can be allocated. The source of funding for these projects includes State appropriations, matching student tuition and fees, sales tax and private funds.

Reaffirmation requests have also been submitted by three other State agencies for continuation funding during the 2015-2017 biennium. These projects include: \$4,883,000 in FY 2016 for the HHS Hastings Regional Center Bldg No. 3 Renovation; \$1,000,000 in both FY 2016 and FY 2017 for the Corrections Infrastructure and Maintenance Continuation; and \$3,000,000 in FY 2016 for the Historical Society Lincoln Museum Renovation.

Existing statutes also designate seven cents of the 64 cents per pack cigarette tax to the Building Renewal

Section II - Existing Commitments



Allocation Fund for use by the Task Force for Building Renewal, with the stipulation that appropriations will not be less than the FY 1998 appropriation of \$9,163,000 per [section 77-2602\(3\)\(c\)](#). The Building Renewal Allocation Fund currently receives the minimum \$9,163,000 appropriation, as seven cents per pack of the cigarette tax currently generates less than \$9,163,000.

The table on the following page lists the eight ongoing capital construction commitments for public postsecondary education.

Section II - Existing Commitments



Capital Construction Reaffirmation Requests 2015-2017 Biennium for the Nebraska State College System, 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 2015 Appr./Reappr.	FY 2016 Reaffirmation	FY 2017 Reaffirmation	
Nebraska State College System								
CSC/WSC	CSC Rangeland II/WSC Conn Libr. Bonds	198	\$17,728,000	\$2,216,000	\$2,216,000	\$2,216,000	\$2,216,000	\$8,864,000
	St. Colleges Systemwide - Misc. Deferred Projects	605	\$30,150,000	\$16,200,000	\$2,325,000	\$2,325,000	\$2,325,000	\$6,975,000
	St. Colleges Systemwide - Fac. Fee Fund Projects	1100	\$8,920,300	\$2,515,300	\$915,000	\$915,000	\$915,000	\$3,660,000
	St. Colleges Systemwide - Sports Fac. Fund Projects	969	\$2,350,000	\$500,000	\$250,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$800,000
	<i>Subtotal - Nebraska State College System</i>		<i>\$59,148,300</i>	<i>\$21,431,300</i>	<i>\$5,706,000</i>	<i>\$5,856,000</i>	<i>\$5,856,000</i>	<i>\$20,299,000</i>
University of Nebraska								
UNL	Veterinary Diagnostics Center	198	\$45,644,000	\$382,450	\$7,101,000	\$6,868,550	\$5,101,000	\$26,191,000
UNMC	College of Nursing - Lincoln Division	198	\$17,650,000	\$0	\$3,127,000	\$3,477,000	\$3,477,000	\$7,569,000
University	Systemwide - Misc. Deferred Projects	605	\$258,500,000	\$130,867,454	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000	\$61,632,546
	<i>Subtotal - University of Nebraska</i>		<i>\$321,794,000</i>	<i>\$131,249,904</i>	<i>\$32,228,000</i>	<i>\$32,345,550</i>	<i>\$30,578,000</i>	<i>\$95,392,546</i>
Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture at Curtis								
NCTA	Education Center	314	\$11,562,330	\$1,996,195	\$820,000	\$820,000	\$820,000	\$7,106,135
	<i>Subtotal - Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture</i>		<i>\$11,562,330</i>	<i>\$1,996,195</i>	<i>\$820,000</i>	<i>\$820,000</i>	<i>\$820,000</i>	<i>\$7,106,135</i>
Total - Nebr. State College Sys. / Univ. of Nebr. / NCTA			\$392,504,630	\$154,677,399	\$38,754,000	\$39,021,550	\$37,254,000	\$122,797,681
Means of Financing								
	State Building Fund (State Income Tax, Sales Tax, etc.)		\$233,893,135	\$82,716,000	\$21,594,000	\$21,739,000	\$21,739,000	\$86,105,135
	Nebraska Capital Construction Fund (Cigarette Taxes)		\$1,603,000	\$1,603,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Civic and Community Center Financing Fund		\$2,350,000	\$500,000	\$250,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$800,000
	Cash/Revolving Funds (includes Capital Improvement Fees)		\$144,858,495	\$69,475,949	\$13,260,000	\$13,115,000	\$13,115,000	\$35,892,546
	Federal Funds		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Private Funds		\$9,800,000	\$382,450	\$3,650,000	\$3,767,550	\$2,000,000	\$0
Total - Nebr. State College Sys. / Univ. of Nebr. / NCTA			\$392,504,630	\$154,677,399	\$38,754,000	\$39,021,550	\$37,254,000	\$122,797,681

Section II - Existing Commitments



Section III - Governing Board Requests

Section III - Governing Board Requests



The Nebraska State College System, the University of Nebraska and the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture have requested funding as outlined in this section for the 2015-2017 biennial capital construction budget request cycle. The tables included in this section can be used to compare with the Commission's recommendations and priorities that follow in Sections IV and V of this document.

Summary of Capital Construction Requests

Capital construction budget requests prepared by the Nebraska State College System's Board of Trustees and the University of Nebraska's Board of Regents address specific facility needs for each of the institutions.


The State Colleges have requested funding for five capital construction projects to include: 1) Design and construction funding to renovate and add to Chadron State College's Math and Science Building; 2) design and construction funding for a biomass energy plant at Peru State College; 3) planning funds for development of a program statement to renovate PSC's Theatre; 4) planning funds for academic planning and development of a program statement to renovate or replace Wayne State

College's Benthack Hall used for industrial technology; and 5) planning funds for development of a sustainable practices and renewable energy master plan for each of the State Colleges. The State Colleges are also seeking funding for Building Renewal Task Force requests for the coming biennium. See page III-6 for the Nebraska State College System's capital construction budget request, in priority order, as approved by the Board of Trustees.

The University has not requested funding for new construction, renovation or planning projects for the 2015-2017 biennium at this time. However, the University has identified Building Renewal Task Force requests for the coming biennium. See page III-8 for the University of Nebraska's capital construction budget request, in priority order, as approved by the Board of Regents. It is possible that the University will seek capital construction appropriations directly from the Legislature in the 2015 legislative session.

The Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture at Curtis has not requested funding for new construction, renovation or planning projects for the 2015-2017 biennium at this time. NCTA has identified Building Renewal Task Force requests for the coming biennium.

Section III - Governing Board Requests



See page III-10 for the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture's capital construction budget request, in priority order, as approved by the Board of Regents.

Task Force for Building Renewal Requests

In addition to requesting funds for individual capital construction projects, institutions request funding from the Building Renewal Allocation Fund administered by the LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal. Since its creation in 1977, the LB 309 Task Force's duties involved reviewing requests and allocating funds to address the most urgent deferred repair 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. Buildings not owned by the State, including revenue bond buildings and buildings being purchased through lease-purchase, are not eligible for funding.


The table on page III-4 of this section summarizes Building Renewal Allocation Fund requests from public postsecondary education institutions during the 2015-2017 biennium. Projects have been submitted totaling

\$539.3 million, which includes institutional cooperative funding of \$5.7 million. The Department of Administrative Services instructions stated that agencies were to submit Class I and Class II requests only for the biennial budget request process (see definitions in Appendix C). Class III needs are no longer identified in current requests. The following table summarizes the change in building renewal Class I & Class II requests compared to the previous biennium by category. The substantial increase in deferred repair requests from the prior biennium is attributed to UNL requesting additional campus-wide deferred repair funding for Class II projects. UNL's estimate is based on the most recent *Facilities Condition Survey* and other campus information used to provide an overall estimate of unmet needs.

Change in Building Renewal Requests for the Nebr. State College System, Univ. of Nebraska & NCTA				
Category	2013-2015 Biennium*	2015-2017 Biennium	Increase/ (Decrease)	% Change
Fire & Life Safety	\$29,639,795	\$27,429,338	(\$2,210,457)	(7.5%)
Deferred Repair	\$223,300,159	\$344,279,624	\$120,979,465	54.2%
ADA	\$17,641,411	\$27,770,554	\$10,129,143	57.4%
Energy Conservtn.	\$138,100,828	\$139,843,117	\$1,742,289	1.3%
Total	\$408,682,193	\$539,322,633	\$130,640,440	32.0%

* Includes Class I & II requests only beginning in the 2009-2011 biennium.

Section III - Governing Board Requests




Cooperative Funding for LB 309 Allocations

The LB 309 Task Force has historically requested that agencies provide cooperative funds for each project allocation. The LB 309 Task Force has informed agencies that cooperative funding is not required for the 2015-2017 biennium; however, it is highly encouraged. Agencies may offer matching funds whenever it is in their best interest to do so.

The cooperative funding policy is intended to provide an institutional investment in a project and allows more projects to be completed with available funds. The Nebraska State College System has historically provided 15% in cooperative funds and the University of Nebraska and NCTA have provided 20% in cooperative funds.


Section III - Governing Board Requests



Combined LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal Requests 2015-2017 Biennium for the Nebraska State College System, University of Nebraska & Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture

Project Type	Nebraska State College System				University of Nebraska						Total - Univ., St. Colleges & NCTA
	CSC	PSC	WSC	Subtotal	UNK	UNL	UNMC	UNO	Subtotal	NCTA	
Fire & Life Safety											
Class I	\$45,000	\$294,000	\$500,000	\$839,000	\$150,000	\$3,278,781	\$8,350,000	\$856,160	\$12,634,941	\$120,000	\$13,593,941
Class II	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,161,600	\$10,511,457	\$0	\$1,477,900	\$13,150,957	\$120,000	\$13,270,957
<i>Subtotals</i>	<i>\$45,000</i>	<i>\$294,000</i>	<i>\$500,000</i>	<i>\$839,000</i>	<i>\$1,311,600</i>	<i>\$13,790,238</i>	<i>\$8,350,000</i>	<i>\$2,334,060</i>	<i>\$25,785,898</i>	<i>\$240,000</i>	<i>\$26,864,898</i>
Deferred Repair											
Class I	\$12,816,089	\$1,532,000	\$12,880,000	\$27,228,089	\$43,000	\$20,012,736	\$4,219,000	\$3,645,200	\$27,919,936	\$635,000	\$55,783,025
Class II	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,191,975	\$255,308,580	\$0	\$16,352,000	\$284,852,555	\$120,000	\$284,972,555
<i>Subtotals</i>	<i>\$12,816,089</i>	<i>\$1,532,000</i>	<i>\$12,880,000</i>	<i>\$27,228,089</i>	<i>\$13,234,975</i>	<i>\$275,321,316</i>	<i>\$4,219,000</i>	<i>\$19,997,200</i>	<i>\$312,772,491</i>	<i>\$755,000</i>	<i>\$340,755,580</i>
Americans with Disabilities Act											
Class I	\$115,000	\$340,000	\$500,000	\$955,000	\$0	\$16,400	\$0	\$80,000	\$96,400	\$80,000	\$1,131,400
Class II	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$640,000	\$23,401,154	\$0	\$2,298,000	\$26,339,154	\$80,000	\$26,419,154
<i>Subtotals</i>	<i>\$115,000</i>	<i>\$340,000</i>	<i>\$500,000</i>	<i>\$955,000</i>	<i>\$640,000</i>	<i>\$23,417,554</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$2,378,000</i>	<i>\$26,435,554</i>	<i>\$160,000</i>	<i>\$27,550,554</i>
Energy Conservation											
Class I	\$2,175,000	\$198,000	\$50,000	\$2,423,000	\$152,000	\$1,120,000	\$1,630,000	\$0	\$2,902,000	\$13,500	\$5,338,500
Class II	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,210,400	\$110,613,617	\$0	\$17,303,000	\$133,127,017	\$28,400	\$133,155,417
<i>Subtotals</i>	<i>\$2,175,000</i>	<i>\$198,000</i>	<i>\$50,000</i>	<i>\$2,423,000</i>	<i>\$5,362,400</i>	<i>\$111,733,617</i>	<i>\$1,630,000</i>	<i>\$17,303,000</i>	<i>\$136,029,017</i>	<i>\$41,900</i>	<i>\$138,493,917</i>
Total Task Force for Building Renewal Requests											
LB309 \$	\$15,151,089	\$2,364,000	\$13,930,000	\$31,445,089	\$20,548,975	\$424,262,725	\$14,199,000	\$42,012,260	\$501,022,960	\$1,196,900	\$533,664,949
Coop. \$	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,960,244	\$0	\$0	\$473,840	\$5,434,084	\$223,600	\$5,657,684
Totals	\$15,151,089	\$2,364,000	\$13,930,000	\$31,445,089	\$25,509,219	\$424,262,725	\$14,199,000	\$42,486,100	\$506,457,044	\$1,420,500	\$539,322,633
	2.8%	0.4%	2.6%	5.8%	4.7%	78.7%	2.6%	7.9%	93.9%	0.3%	100.0%


Section III - Governing Board Requests



Nebraska State College System

The table on the following page provides the Nebraska State College System's Capital Construction Budget Request for the 2015-2017 Biennium in the priority order recommended by the Nebraska State College System's Board of Trustees. The list also includes the State Colleges' Building Renewal Task Force requests and priorities.


Section III - Governing Board Requests



Capital Construction Request Summary for the Nebraska State College System 2015-2017 Biennium

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Governing Bd. Priority	Total Request	Prior Expenditure	FY 2015 App/Reap	FY 2016 Request	FY 2017 Request	Future Request
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY	1	\$839,000	\$0	\$0	\$839,000	\$0	\$0
DEFERRED REPAIR	2	\$27,228,089	\$0	\$0	\$27,228,089	\$0	\$0
AMERICANS W/ DISABILITIES ACT (ADA)	3	\$955,000	\$0	\$0	\$955,000	\$0	\$0
ENERGY CONSERVATION	4	\$2,423,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,423,000	\$0	\$0
CSC - MATH SCIENCE RENOV./ADD.	5	\$25,281,664	\$0	\$0	\$8,425,094	\$7,405,886	\$9,450,684
PSC - BIOMASS ENERGY	6	\$3,832,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,200,000	\$2,632,000	\$0
WSC - INDUSTRIAL TECH. PLANNING	7	\$227,000	\$0	\$0	\$227,000	\$0	\$0
PSC - THEATRE RENOVATION PLANNING	8	\$70,000	\$0	\$0	\$70,000	\$0	\$0
NSCS - ENERGY MASTER PLAN	9	\$75,000	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$0	\$0
TOTAL		\$60,930,753	\$0	\$0	\$41,442,183	\$10,037,886	\$9,450,684
FUND SOURCE		Total Request	Prior Expenditure	FY 2015 App/Reap	FY 2016 Request	FY 2017 Request	Future Request
STATE GEN. FUND/NCCF/CIG. TAX/LOTTERY		\$18,054,575	\$0	\$0	\$6,738,474	\$5,865,417	\$5,450,684
CASH FUND (TUITION & FEES)		\$2,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,000,000
FEDERAL FUNDS		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LB309 TASK FORCE (DUPLICATE REQUEST)		\$7,431,089	\$0	\$0	\$3,258,620	\$4,172,469	\$0
PRIVATE DONATIONS		\$2,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,000,000
SUBTOTAL		\$29,485,664	\$0	\$0	\$9,997,094	\$10,037,886	\$9,450,684
LB309 TASK FORCE FUNDING		\$31,445,089	\$0	\$0	\$31,445,089	\$0	\$0
LB309 COOPERATIVE FUNDING		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUBTOTAL		\$31,445,089	\$0	\$0	\$31,445,089	\$0	\$0
TOTAL		\$60,930,753	\$0	\$0	\$41,442,183	\$10,037,886	\$9,450,684

Section III - Governing Board Requests




University of Nebraska

The table on the following page provides the University of Nebraska's Capital Construction Budget Request 2015-2017 Biennium in the priority order recommended by the University of Nebraska's Board of Regents. The University has currently identified only Building Renewal Task Force requests for the biennium.

The University has initiated a capital planning process with Sasaki Associates, a leading consultant in master planning, in order to determine and prioritize its capital needs. The completion of this process has not been finalized at this time. It is possible that a State appropriations request for capital construction projects could result from this study.

The Board of Regents is also provided with a quarterly status of a Six-Year Capital Plan that includes several projects in which State funds are identified. Projects listed in the Six-Year Capital Plan include the UNK Otto Olsen II (\$30,510,000), UNCA USPFO Building Renovation (\$5,100,000), UNO Metropolitan STEM Center (\$80,000,000), and UNK Fine Arts Renovation/Addition (\$17,237,000 plus \$383,500 in other funding).


Section III - Governing Board Requests



Capital Construction Request Summary for the University of Nebraska 2015-2017 Biennium

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Governing Bd. Priority	Total Request	Prior Expenditure	FY 2015 App/Reap	FY 2016 Request	FY 2017 Request	Future Request
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY	1	\$26,290,338	\$0	\$0	\$12,848,981	\$13,441,357	\$0
DEFERRED REPAIR	2	\$316,181,535	\$0	\$0	\$28,159,736	\$288,021,799	\$0
ENERGY CONSERVATION	3	\$137,369,617	\$0	\$0	\$2,940,000	\$134,429,617	\$0
AMERICANS W/ DISABILITIES ACT (ADA)	4	\$26,615,554	\$0	\$0	\$116,400	\$26,499,154	\$0
TOTAL		\$506,457,044	\$0	\$0	\$44,065,117	\$462,391,927	\$0
FUND SOURCE		Total Request	Prior Expenditure	FY 2015 App/Reap	FY 2016 Request	FY 2017 Request	Future Request
STATE GENERAL FUND/NCCF/CIG. TAX		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
CASH FUND (TUITION & FEES)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FEDERAL FUNDS		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
REVOLVING FUNDS		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
PRIVATE DONATIONS		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUBTOTAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LB309 TASK FORCE FUNDING		\$501,022,960	\$0	\$0	\$43,553,277	\$457,469,683	\$0
LB309 COOPERATIVE FUNDING		\$5,434,084	\$0	\$0	\$511,840	\$4,922,244	\$0
SUBTOTAL		\$506,457,044	\$0	\$0	\$44,065,117	\$462,391,927	\$0
TOTAL		\$506,457,044	\$0	\$0	\$44,065,117	\$462,391,927	\$0


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 2015-2017 Biennium in the priority order recommended by the University of Nebraska's Board of Regents. NCTA has currently identified only Building Renewal Task Force requests for the coming biennium.

Section III - Governing Board Requests




Capital Construction Request Summary for the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture 2015-2017 Biennium

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Governing Bd. Priority	Total Request	Prior Expenditure	FY 2015 App/Reap	FY 2016 Request	FY 2017 Request	Future Request
FIRE/LIFE SAFETY	1	\$300,000	\$0	\$0	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$0
DEFERRED REPAIR	2	\$870,000	\$0	\$0	\$720,000	\$150,000	\$0
ENERGY CONSERVATION	3	\$50,500	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	\$35,500	\$0
AMERICANS W/ DISABILITIES ACT (ADA)	4	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
TOTAL		\$1,420,500	\$0	\$0	\$985,000	\$435,500	\$0
FUND SOURCE		Total Request	Prior Expenditure	FY 2015 App/Reap	FY 2016 Request	FY 2017 Request	Future Request
STATE GENERAL FUND/NCCF/CIG. TAX		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
CASH FUND (TUITION & FEES)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FEDERAL FUNDS		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
REVOLVING FUNDS		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
PRIVATE DONATIONS		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUBTOTAL		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LB309 TASK FORCE FUNDING		\$1,196,900	\$0	\$0	\$848,500	\$348,400	\$0
LB309 COOPERATIVE FUNDING		\$223,600	\$0	\$0	\$136,500	\$87,100	\$0
SUBTOTAL		\$1,420,500	\$0	\$0	\$985,000	\$435,500	\$0
TOTAL		\$1,420,500	\$0	\$0	\$985,000	\$435,500	\$0

Section IV - Commission's Statewide Capital Construction Budget Recommendations

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



The table at the end of this section lists all capital construction requests from the Nebraska State College System, the University of Nebraska and the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture (NCTA). The table identifies the Commission's funding recommendation for each approved 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.

Commission review and approval is required of statutorily defined "capital construction projects" before State tax funds may be expended. This includes projects that utilize more than \$2,000,000 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 as administered by the LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal. The combined recommendation by category (fire & life safety, deferred repair, Americans with Disability Act (ADA) and energy conservation) and classification are included in the table at the end of this section.


Finally, the table includes reaffirmation requests that received partial funding in prior biennia. The Commission is recommending funding each of the reaffirmation requests as requested by the institutions.

Summary of Recommended Budget Modifications

The Commission is recommending budget modifications to the following requests:

- *LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal requests:*
The Commission recommends increasing the annual appropriation to the Building Renewal Allocation Fund that is available for higher education projects to a level that would address the most urgent requests outlined in the table at the end of this section (an increase of \$9 million per year over current appropriations). Within the list of individual building renewal requests, the Commission recommends funding modifications to the following with rationale provided:
 - *CSC Math Science Building* – \$7,431,089 request for HVAC, electrical and fire/life safety upgrades.
The Commission recommends that the Legislature

Section IV - Commission Recommendations




consider funding these needs from State General Funds as part of the overall renovation/addition request. This would provide the LB 309 Task Force with additional funds for its many other unmet needs.

- PSC Theatre – \$1,370,000 request for HVAC, electrical and ADA upgrades. *The Commission recommends that the LB 309 Task Force considers delaying funding of this request until completion of a program statement that would identify the overall scope and costs associated with this type of work.*
- WSC Benthack Hall – \$4,830,000 request for HVAC and code upgrades, structural upgrades and window replacement. *The Commission recommends that the LB 309 Task Force considers delaying funding of this request until completion of a program statement that would identify the overall scope and costs associated with this type of work, including the feasibility of renovation versus replacement of the existing facility.*
- UNMC Durham Outpatient Center – \$750,000 request for electrical upgrades. *The Commission*

recommends that the LB 309 Task Force take into consideration that this facility is primarily used for patient care that generates patient revenue. Patient care facilities do not typically receive State tax fund support.

- UNMC Lied Transplant Center – \$100,000 request for deferred maintenance. *The Commission recommends that the LB 309 Task Force take into consideration that this facility is primarily used for patient care that generates patient revenue. Patient care facilities do not typically receive State tax fund support.*
- PSC Biomass Energy Center: Consider appropriating funds only associated with developing a revised cost efficiency study and program statement for this project. Commission review and approval is required prior to any expenditure for design and construction.
- WSC Industrial Technology Facilities Planning: Consider appropriating funds only associated with developing the program statement for this project. Costs associated with schematic design can be funded following review and approval by the Commission.

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



The following table summarizes institutional capital construction requests for State appropriations and the Commission's recommended funding modifications for the 2015-2017 biennium:

Project Name	2015-2017 Biennium	
	Institutional State Funding Request	Commission Recommendation
Reaffirmation Requests	\$44,278,000	\$44,278,000
Building Renewal Requests	\$533,664,949	\$38,431,955
CSC Math Science Renov./Add.	\$15,850,575	\$15,830,980
NSCS Energy Master Plan	\$75,000	\$75,000
PSC Biomass Energy Center	\$3,832,000	\$75,000
PSC Theatre Renov. Planning	\$70,000	\$70,000
WSC Industrial Tech. Planning	\$227,000	\$77,000
Totals	\$597,997,524	\$98,837,935

The following pages contain summaries of each capital construction request, including the amount of State funding requested, Commission action on approval (if required), recommended funding by the Commission (including modifications if applicable), and a project description.

LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal Capital Construction Budget Request:

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


Budget Request: \$533,664,949 (higher ed.)

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

Budget Recommendation: The Commission recommends increasing appropriations to the Building Renewal Allocation Fund from the current \$9,163,000 per year to a minimum of \$18 million per year. Additional funding is necessary to address construction inflation that has nearly doubled since the current funding level was established in 1998.

Project Description: The request includes Fire & Life Safety, Deferred Repair, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Energy Conservation requests from the Nebraska State College System, University of Nebraska and Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture. Institutions would provide \$5,657,684 in cooperative funds in addition to the funding request identified above.

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



Nebraska State College System Capital Construction Budget Request:

CSC Math and Science Building Renovation

Budget Request: \$13,850,575

Commission Approval: Approved Sept. 16, 2014

Budget Recommendation: The Commission recommends State appropriations not to exceed \$21.282 million be allocated after the College has confirmed \$4 million in private donations and cash funds have been secured for this project. The Commission recommends that the Legislature consider funding the entire renovation portion of the request from State General Funds. This would provide the LB 309 Task Force with additional funds for its many other unmet needs.

Project Description: Chadron State College is requesting funds to expand and renovate the Math and Science building located on campus. The existing 57,092 gross square foot facility was constructed in 1968 and has inefficient mechanical and electrical systems, including inadequate air quality and climate control. The proposed project would be completed in three phases of construction. The addition on the north side of the building would be the first phase, followed by renovation of the


east wing, with renovation of the west wing completing the project. An additional 14,564 gross square feet would be added to the existing building that would undergo a major renovation. The building currently houses the Math program, Geology program and museum, Herbarium, Physics program, Chemistry program, Biology program, Planetarium and the Rural Health Opportunities Program (RHOP). RHOP graduates students that are accepted into the University of Nebraska Medical School for various medical professions (dentistry, dental hygiene, medicine, pharmacy, nursing, clinical lab science, physician assistant, physical therapy, radiography). Since the RHOP program began at Chadron State College, 77% of the participants have practiced at some point in their career in a rural community.

PSC Biomass Energy Center

Budget Request: \$3,832,000

Commission Approval: The Board of Trustees approved a program statement in June 2009, which identified federal, institutional operating and grant funding as the source of funds. Commission approval was not required because of the funding sources identified. A

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



revised program statement has not been submitted to the Commission for review and approval at this time.

Budget Recommendation: The Commission recommends \$75,000 in planning funds for development of a revised program statement at this time. As presently proposed, it is likely that the equipment associated with this proposal would become obsolete prior to reaching any simple payback period from energy savings. The Commission would expect a revised program statement to propose a facility that would provide a 10-year or less simple payback period.

Project Description: The request would provide design, construction and equipment funding for a biomass energy center to provide steam heat for the PSC campus. The biomass energy center would be established at the existing Neal Hall building site at the Centennial Complex, which is ½ mile from the center of the main campus. The biomass energy center would burn chipped waste wood to generate steam for heating, cooling and hot water use on the PSC campus. The project includes improvements to the existing steam distribution system and provision for wood chip storage at the site of the biomass energy center. PSC anticipates the biomass energy center will

result in utility cost savings of \$182,600 in the first year of operation.

PSC Theatre Renovation Planning

Budget Request: \$70,000

Commission Approval: Approval not required for planning requests.

Budget Recommendation: Funding is recommended for development of a program statement. Commission review and approval of the Board of Trustees' approved program statement is then necessary prior to allocation of additional State funding for design and construction.

Project Description: Peru State College is requesting funding to develop a program statement for the renovation of the Theatre. The 13,775 gross square foot auditorium/theatre was constructed in 1922. It has a stage and a seating capacity of 631 persons on the main floor and balcony. Similar to student centers and athletics facilities, theatres are often the "face" of an institution and can facilitate or detract from enrollment enhancement efforts. The College states that current design of the theatre does not effectively support the needs of current and future students, or of the regional community served by open performances and events. Renovation would

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



address aged, unsafe and inefficient building systems, enhance the efficiency of building operations, and ultimately provide additional large-scale instructional and presentation space. Performance equipment upgrades and expansion of the existing lobby to accommodate pre-function activities would facilitate the performance atmosphere that theater and music programs require. An elevator to the second floor would make the building more ADA accessible.

WSC Industrial Technology Facilities Planning


Budget Request: \$227,000

Commission Approval: Approval not required for planning requests.

Budget Recommendation: Funding is recommended for the \$77,000 requested to develop a program statement to study the renovation or replacement of Benthack Hall. Commission review and approval of the Board of Trustees' approved program statement is then necessary prior to allocation of additional State funding for design and construction. The Commission does not recommend an appropriation for architectural/engineering schematic design fees at this time.

Project Description: Wayne State College is requesting funding to conduct a study of regional needs for Industrial Technology graduates, to evaluate the current Industrial Technology academic program, and make necessary programmatic adjustments to ensure the strength and currency of the program. WSC proposes to carefully reevaluate its program to be sure it is producing graduates who can satisfy the demands of area employers. Following the programmatic needs assessment, the College would evaluate existing facilities and equipment available for this program. Industrial Technology is housed in Benthack Hall, built in 1972. Other than a roof replacement in 2007, the 43,500 gross square foot building remains basically as it was constructed. The College states there is a need to upgrade the HVAC system, lighting, windows, interior finishes, equipment, and furnishings. The structure is inadequate for teaching construction technology classes, because its' existing labs lack adequate bay height. The *2012 Campus Master Plan* recommends review of an alternate site on campus to house instruction of construction technology. The College's request provides funding for a programmatic needs assessment, course development, planning for facilities appropriate to meet

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



defined needs and professional design services/programming for renovation/construction.

NSCS Sustainable Practices & Renewable Energy Master Plan

Budget Request: \$75,000

Commission Approval: Approval not required for planning requests.

Budget Recommendation: Funding is recommended for development of a sustainable practices & renewable energy master plan. Commission review and approval of any applicable capital construction projects as defined in statutes and Commission rules and regulations would then be necessary prior to allocation of additional State funding for design and construction.

Project Description: The Nebraska State College System requests funding to develop a plan to improve sustainable practices and to reduce energy and carbon consumption systemwide. The Master Plan would develop a focused and planned integration of renewable and alternative solutions for energy demands. This master planning effort would address general environmental performance measures and policies at each of the three State Colleges with specific attention on recommendations

for alternative and renewable energy utilization.

Renewable energy sources can be found in many forms including wind turbine, geothermal, recycling centers, biomass, passive and photovoltaic solar, anaerobic digestion, and other sources. The study would take the following into consideration:

Renewable Power - Identify and target beneficial alternative energy systems for new building construction, additions, major renovations and adaptive reuse.

Energy Efficiency - Establish a baseline and target reductions.

Greenhouse Gases - Reduce greenhouse gas emission through reduction of energy use.

Building Performance - Establish sustainability strategies, including resource conservation, reduction and use patterns, siting, and indoor environmental quality. Include consideration for environmentally sound construction and resource utilization aimed at reducing the NSCS carbon footprint.

Water Conservation - Establish baseline of water usage and targets for reduction of water consumption.

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



University of Nebraska Capital Construction Budget Request:

The University of Nebraska has not requested funding for new construction, renovation or planning projects for the 2015-2017 biennium at this time. As previously noted, the University has initiated a capital planning process with a master planning consultant in order to determine and prioritize its capital needs. The completion of this process has not been completed at this time. It is possible that a State appropriations request for capital construction projects could result from this study.

Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture Capital Construction Budget Request:

NCTA has not requested funding for new construction, renovation or planning projects for the 2015-2017 biennium at this time.


LB 605 Facilities Fee Projects:

The Legislature passed LB 605 and the Governor signed the bill into law in April 2006. The bill authorized the expenditure of up to \$288.65 million in State

appropriations and matching institutional funding (student tuition and fees) to finance long-term bonds through University and State College facilities corporations. Bond issues financed over 14 years through FY 2020 have funded several University and State College facility renovation/replacement and campus infrastructure projects.

The Commission has reviewed and approved each project included in the LB 605 legislation that exceeded the Commission's statutory review threshold. Nineteen University and six State College projects are substantially complete, with the UNL Behlen Laboratory renovation and UNK utilities extension projects currently in the design and construction phase. Funding for these bond issues constitutes a significant portion of the Commission's recommended funding for the 2015-2017 biennium.


Section IV - Commission Recommendations



Capital Construction Budget Recommendations 2015-2017 Biennium for the Nebraska State College System, 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 2016	FY 2017		
Reaffirmation of Partially Funded Projects							
CSC/WSC	CSC Rangeland II/WSC Conn Libr. Bonds	\$17,728,000	\$4,432,000	\$2,216,000	\$2,216,000	\$8,864,000	Approved 2 Projects
St. Col./Univ.	Systemwide - LB605 Facilities Fee Projects	\$288,650,000	\$171,392,454	\$24,325,000	\$24,325,000	\$68,607,546	Approved 21 Projects
St. Colleges	Systemwide - LB1100 Facilities Fee Projects	\$8,920,300	\$3,430,300	\$915,000	\$915,000	\$3,660,000	Approved 5 Projects
St. Colleges	Systemwide - Sports Fac. Fund Projects	\$2,350,000	\$750,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$800,000	Future Submittals?
UNL	Veterinary Diagnostics Center	\$45,644,000	\$7,483,450	\$6,868,550	\$5,101,000	\$26,191,000	Approved
UNMC	College of Nursing - Lincoln Division	\$17,650,000	\$3,127,000	\$3,477,000	\$3,477,000	\$7,569,000	Approved
NCTA	Education Center	\$11,562,330	\$2,816,195	\$820,000	\$820,000	\$7,106,135	Approved
<i>Subtotal - Reaffirmations</i>		<i>\$392,504,630</i>	<i>\$193,431,399</i>	<i>\$39,021,550</i>	<i>\$37,254,000</i>	<i>\$122,797,681</i>	
LB 309 Task Force for Building Renewal							
St. Col./Univ.	ADA - Class I Requests	\$1,171,400	\$0	\$0	\$585,700	\$585,700	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	ADA - Class II Requests	\$26,599,154	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,599,154	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Deferred Repair - Class I Requests	\$42,376,736	\$0	\$10,594,184	\$10,594,184	\$21,188,368	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Deferred Repair - Class II Requests	\$288,171,799	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$288,171,799	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Energy Conservation - Class I Requests	\$5,378,000	\$0	\$1,344,500	\$1,344,500	\$2,689,000	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Energy Conservation - Class II Requests	\$134,465,117	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$134,465,117	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Fire & Life Safety - Class I Requests	\$13,087,981	\$0	\$9,815,986	\$3,271,995	\$0	Approval Not Required
St. Col./Univ.	Fire & Life Safety - Class II Requests	\$13,591,357	\$0	\$0	\$1,359,136	\$12,232,221	Approval Not Required
<i>Subtotal - LB 309 Task Force Requests</i>		<i>\$524,841,544</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$21,754,670</i>	<i>\$17,155,515</i>	<i>\$485,931,359</i>	
Nebraska State College System							
CSC	Math Science Renovation/Addition	\$25,281,664	\$0	\$8,425,094	\$7,405,886	\$9,450,684	Approved
NSCS	Energy Master Plan	\$75,000	\$0	\$75,000	\$0	\$0	Approval Not Required
PSC	Biomass Energy Center	\$75,000	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$0	Pending Additional Study
PSC	Theatre Renovation Planning	\$70,000	\$0	\$70,000	\$0	\$0	Approval Not Required
WSC	Industrial Technology Facility Planning	\$77,000	\$0	\$77,000	\$0	\$0	Approval Not Required
<i>Subtotal - Nebraska State College System</i>		<i>\$25,578,664</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$8,647,094</i>	<i>\$7,480,886</i>	<i>\$9,450,684</i>	
University of Nebraska							
UN		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Future Submittals?
<i>Subtotal - University of Nebraska</i>		<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	
Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture at Curtis							
NCTA		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<i>Subtotal - Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture</i>		<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	
Total - Nebr. State College Sys. / Univ. of Nebr. / NCTA		\$942,924,838	\$193,431,399	\$69,423,314	\$61,890,401	\$618,179,724	
Means of Financing							
State Bldg. Fund/NE Capital Constr. Fund/Cig. Taxes		\$778,258,659	\$105,913,000	\$51,866,659	\$46,171,276	\$574,307,725	
Civic and Community Center Financing Fund		\$2,350,000	\$750,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$800,000	
Cash/Revolving Funds (incl. CIF & LB 309 Coop Funds)		\$150,516,179	\$82,735,949	\$13,389,105	\$13,319,125	\$41,072,000	
LB309 Task Force for Bldg. Renewal (CSC Math/Sci. request)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Private Funds		\$11,800,000	\$4,032,450	\$3,767,550	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	
Total - Nebr. State College Sys. / Univ. of Nebr. / NCTA		\$942,924,838	\$193,431,399	\$69,423,314	\$61,890,401	\$618,179,724	

Section IV - Commission Recommendations



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

Section V - Commission Prioritization of Approved Projects



The Commission's priorities for the 2015-2017 biennium are included on page V-5. This recommended sequencing of approved capital construction projects combines the separate budget requests from the Nebraska State College System, the University of Nebraska and the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture. Only capital projects previously approved by the governing boards and the Commission that are requesting State funding in the current biennial budget request are considered for prioritization by the Commission.

The Commission's prioritized list is a statewide perspective of the most urgent capital construction needs for the coming biennium. The intent of this prioritization is to assist the Governor and Legislature in developing a strategy to address the most urgent institutional facility needs. The Commission's highest priorities for the 2015-2017 biennium are 1) Fire and Life Safety – Class I requests, 2) Deferred Repair – Class I requests and 3) Chadron State College's Math Science renovation/addition.


Institutions and the State require a significant investment each biennium to maintain existing public four-year postsecondary education State-supported

facilities in a current state of condition. Should sufficient funding be unavailable over an extended time, backlogs of deferred repair and renovation/remodeling projects can add to this need.

Reaffirmation funding of previously approved renovation/repair projects helps to meet a portion of this need. The Building Renewal Allocation Fund also addresses a portion of this need by funding urgently needed deferred repair. Institutional operating funds and private donations also address some deferred repair and renovation/ remodeling needs. Many of the institutional requests for State appropriations for the 2015-2017 biennium also address this need for renewal and adaptation of facilities.

The Commission recommends funding projects in their entirety as revenue becomes available. Without full funding: 1) Overall project costs increase 5% to 10% due to additional contractor start-up and shut-down costs; 2) partially funded projects require phasing that increases project costs due to inflation; and 3) the needs of the students, faculty, staff and public that utilize these facilities are not fully met.

Section V - Commission Prioritization of Approved Projects



Methodology

In developing a list of statewide priorities, the Commission uses 10 weighted criteria to evaluate individual capital construction project requests. The percentage resulting from these criteria's cumulative point total establishes the recommended funding order of capital projects. In developing the prioritization process, a primary goal of the Commission is to protect building occupants, complete partially funded projects, and prevent further deterioration of the State's existing physical assets.

The following outline provides a synopsis of each criterion, including the maximum point total for each.

1. **Statewide Facilities Category** (30 pts. maximum)

The Commission determines statewide ranking of broad facilities request categories as part of a continual evaluation of the State's needs.

2. **Sector Initiatives** (10 points maximum)

Governing boards may designate initiatives that promote immediate sector capital construction needs for the coming biennium.

3. **Strategic and Long-Range Planning** (10 pts. max.)

Governing boards may display the need for individual

capital construction requests through institutional strategic and long-range planning.

4. **Immediacy of Need** (10 points maximum)

Urgency of need for a capital construction request is considered.

5. **Quality of Facility** (10 points maximum)

The prioritization process analyzes the condition and functional use of existing space.

6. **Avoid Unnecessary Duplication** (10 points max.)

The process evaluates unnecessary duplication by reviewing a project's ability to increase access and/or serve a valid need while avoiding unnecessary duplication.


7. **Appropriate Quantity of Space** (5 points maximum)

An institution can show how a capital construction request provides an appropriate quantity of space for the intended program or service.

8. **Statewide Role and Mission** (5 points maximum)

Broad statewide role and mission categories are considered.

Section V - Commission Prioritization of Approved Projects



9. Facility Maintenance Expenditures (5 points max.)

This process considers the ability of an institution to maintain its existing facilities.

10. Ongoing Costs (5 points maximum)

Potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a capital construction project is considered.

The Commission's *Prioritization Process to Sequence Appropriations for Approved Capital Construction Projects* provides detailed definitions of each individual criterion. The entire document is located on the Commission's website at www.ccpe.ne.gov. Explanatory information regarding the prioritization of individual capital construction project requests is included at the end of this section.

Sector Initiatives

The Commission encourages governing boards to target specific areas of their capital budget requests as "sector initiatives." 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 evaluations must also consider strategic initiatives for postsecondary education in order to 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 Commission's prioritization process allows the Nebraska State College System Board of Trustees to identify up to two sector initiatives and the University of Nebraska Central Administration to designate up to three sector initiatives.

Nebraska State College System:

The Nebraska State College System Board of Trustees approved the following language:

- "To enhance educational opportunities for students and increase the potential for enrollment and retention, the Board of Trustees of the Nebraska State College System will focus its attention during the 2015-17 biennium on capital projects that renovate existing instructional and recreational facilities to the most efficient, productive condition possible.
- Where new construction is necessary to replace a deteriorating facility, enhance technology learning and

Section V - Commission Prioritization of Approved Projects



utilization, or accommodate enrollment growth in our service area, the facilities will incorporate the most energy efficient, easily maintained construction components that can be acquired within allowable resources. Technology resources will be designed to facilitate cooperative ventures with educational partners and enhance opportunities for student access and administrative savings.”

Olsen renovation - phase two (approved October 12, 2000).


University of Nebraska:

The University of Nebraska has not provided sector initiatives in its biennial capital construction budget request. The University currently has no State appropriation request for individual capital construction projects.

Other Previously Approved Projects

Changes in governing board priorities sometimes result in previously requested projects being excluded in future biennial budget request cycles. There is one project previously approved by the Commission that is not included in a governing board request for this biennial capital construction budget request cycle is the UNK Otto

Section V - Commission Prioritization of Approved Projects



Statewide Capital Priority Recommendations 2015-2017 Biennium for the Nebraska State College System, University of Nebraska & Nebr. College of Technical Agriculture

Priority	Institution	Project Title ¹	2015-2017 Biennium State Appropriation 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	\$12,843,941	30.0	0.0	---	10.0	10.0	10.0	---	3.6	4.6	3.0	71.2	85	84%	
2.	St. Col./Univ.	Deferred Repair - Class I Requests	\$21,025,968	27.0	0.0	---	10.0	9.0	10.0	---	4.4	4.7	3.0	68.1	85	80%	
3.	CSC	Math Science Renovation/Addition	\$15,830,980	18.4	10.0	8.0	9.0	8.0	10.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	79.4	100	79%	
4.	St. Col./Univ.	Energy Conservation - Class I Requests	\$2,669,250	24.0	0.0	---	9.0	8.0	10.0	---	3.9	4.8	5.0	64.7	85	76%	
5.	St. Col./Univ.	ADA - Class I Requests	\$545,700	24.0	0.0	---	9.0	8.0	10.0	---	4.9	4.6	3.0	63.5	85	75%	
6.	WSC	Industrial Technology Facility Planning	\$77,000	18.0	0.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	---	5.0	5.0	2.0	66.0	95	69%	
6.	PSC	Theatre Renovation Planning	\$70,000	18.0	0.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	---	4.0	5.0	3.0	66.0	95	69%	
8.	St. Col./Univ.	Fire & Life Safety - Class II Requests	\$1,327,096	21.0	0.0	---	8.0	7.0	10.0	---	4.4	4.0	3.0	57.3	85	67%	
9.	NSCS	Energy Master Plan	\$75,000	18.0	0.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	10.0	---	4.6	5.0	4.0	60.6	95	64%	
10.	St. Col./Univ.	Deferred Repair - Class II Requests	\$0	12.0	0.0	---	7.0	4.0	10.0	---	4.3	4.5	3.0	44.8	85	53%	
11.	St. Col./Univ.	Energy Conservation - Class II Requests	\$0	9.0	0.0	---	6.0	3.0	10.0	---	4.3	4.2	4.0	40.5	85	48%	
12.	PSC	Biomass Energy Center	\$75,000	9.0	0.0	6.0	1.0	3.0	10.0	---	4.6	5.0	4.0	42.6	95	45%	
13.	St. Col./Univ.	ADA - Class II Requests	\$0	6.0	0.0	---	6.0	2.0	10.0	---	4.3	4.5	3.0	35.8	85	42%	
Possible Points for each Prioritization Criterion			\$54,539,935	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. <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." <i>Comments:</i> This request does not contain a designated sector initiative.</p>	0	10
<p>3. Degree that project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities plans. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of need for the project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects require immediate action to ensure the safety of occupants and protect the State’s capital investments.</p>	10	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <i>Comments:</i> Fire & Life Safety – Class I requests are awarded the maximum points allowed for this criterion.</p>	10	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

#1 LB 309 / Fire & Life Safety – Class I Requests Continued



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 in the project compared to statewide role and 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>	3.58	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 of which UNK and UNO projects received less than the maximum points allowed.</p>	4.60	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
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>	71.2	85
<p>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</p>	83.7%	

#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> This request does not contain a designated sector initiative.</p>	0	10
<p>3. Degree that project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities plans. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of 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
<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

#2 LB 309 / Deferred Repair – Class I Requests Continued



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 in the project compared to statewide role and 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>	4.39	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, UNL, UNMC, UNO and NCTA. A weighted average of points awarded to each institution was used in awarding points for this request of which UNK and UNO projects received less than the maximum points allowed.</p>	4.68	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
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>	68.1	85
<p>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</p>	80.1%	

#3 CSC / Math Science Renovation/Addition




Date of Governing Board Approval: January 14, 2014 / September 6, 2014 Addendum

Date of Commission Approval: September 16, 2014

Phasing Considerations: No additional 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> Partial funding (15.8% of the project) with non-State (private and institutional cash) funds would offset State appropriations. This is ranked 2nd among statewide facilities categories. Remaining points are assigned proportionally to the square footage of renovation and new construction, which are ranked 5th and 7th respectively of 10 statewide facilities categories.</p>	18.4	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative."</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> One of the two State Colleges' sector initiatives states: "To enhance educational opportunities for students and increase the potential for enrollment and retention, the Board of Trustees of the Nebraska State College System will focus its attention during the 2015-17 biennium on capital projects that renovate existing instructional and recreational facilities to the most efficient, productive condition possible." This project would renovate instructional space.</p>	10	10
<p>3. Degree that project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities plans.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> The CSC 2012 Campus Master Plan adopted by the Board of Trustees on April 20, 2012, identified the need to renovate and add to the Math Science Building. The Plan identifies external and internal environmental trends, forecasts and assumptions that affect the project's programs and services. The Plan does not link strategic planning initiatives to this capital plan.</p>	8	10
<p>4. The immediacy of need for the project.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Project funding is needed in the next few years to address an aging facility that no longer adequately serves the students, faculty and public that extensively utilizes this facility.</p>	9	10

#3 CSC / Math Science Renovation/Addition Continued



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. The proposed project would address functional, infrastructure, equipment and environmental deficiencies.</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.</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 generally meets space guidelines and utilization standards and has been adequately justified.</p>	4	5
<p>8. Types of space in the project compared to statewide role and mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This proposal affects instructional and academic-support space.</p>	5	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Facility maintenance expenditures on State-supported buildings at CSC averaged 1.14% of their current replacement value for the most recent biennium.</p>	5	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> This project includes a justifiable request for additional State resources for new building operations and maintenance costs.</p>	2	5
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>	79.4	100
<p>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</p>	79.4%	

#4 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 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 project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities plans. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of 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 should be five years or less, and should be addressed this biennium.</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 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.</p>	10	10

#4 LB 309 / Energy Conservation – Class I Requests Continued



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 in the project compared to statewide role and 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>	3.92	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 and NCTA. A weighted average of points awarded to each institution was used in awarding points for this request, of which UNK projects received less than the maximum points allowed.</p>	4.82	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects should provide a simple payback of five years or less after which the State would see a return on its investment.</p>	5	5
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>	64.7	85
<p>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</p>	76.2%	

#5 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> Americans with Disabilities Act – 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 project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities plans. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of need for the project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects are considered items that are clearly necessary to comply with the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design or have been deemed necessary by physically challenged individuals to gain program access, which should be addressed this biennium.</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.</p>	10	10

#5 LB 309 / Americans with Disabilities Act – Class I Requests Continued



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 in the project compared to statewide role and mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This request will provide accessibility to instructional, academic/student support, research and administrative/operational facilities. A weighted average of points awarded for each type of space was used in awarding points for this request.</p>	4.88	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, UNL, UNO and NCTA. A weighted average of points awarded to each institution was used in awarding points for this request, of which UNO projects received less than the maximum points allowed.</p>	4.62	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
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>	63.5	85
<p>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</p>	74.7%	


#6 WSC Industrial Technology Facility Planning



Date of Governing Board Approval: June 10, 2014
Date of Commission Approval: Not required for development of a program statement.
Phasing Considerations: No additional 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> Master planning and programming requests are ranked 5th out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall capital construction needs.</p>	18	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative." <i>Comments:</i> Master planning and programming requests are not specifically identified as a sector initiative by the Nebraska State College Board of Trustees for the 2015-2017 biennium.</p>	0	10
<p>3. Degree that project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities plans. <i>Comments:</i> The WSC 2012 Campus Master Plan adopted by the Board of Trustees on April 20, 2012, identified the need to renovate Benthack Hall and relocate construction technology space. 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 need for the project. <i>Comments:</i> This request should be funded in the next couple biennia to assess the renovation and/or replacement needs of an aging facility.</p>	8	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <i>Comments:</i> The existing facility constructed in 1972 is in fair physical condition. A new roof was installed in 2007. Project planning should evaluate all functional problems with existing spaces.</p>	8	10

#6 WSC Industrial Technology Facility Planning Continued



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 detailed space needs would be developed as part of the project's programming phase.</p>	0	0
<p>8. Types of space in the project compared to statewide role and mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This proposal affects undergraduate instructional and academic-support space</p>	5	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Facility maintenance expenditures on State-supported buildings at WSC averaged 1.28% of their current replacement value for the most recent biennium.</p>	5	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> This project may require additional State resources for new building operations and maintenance costs.</p>	2	5
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>	66.0	95
<p>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</p>	69.5%	


#6 PSC / Theatre Renovation Planning



Date of Governing Board Approval: June 10, 2014
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> Master planning and programming requests are ranked 5th out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall capital construction needs.</p>	18	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative." <i>Comments:</i> Master planning and programming requests are not specifically identified as a sector initiative by the Nebraska State College Board of Trustees for the 2015-2017 biennium.</p>	0	10
<p>3. Degree that project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities plans. <i>Comments:</i> The PSC 2012 Campus Master Plan adopted by the Board of Trustees on April 20, 2012, identified the need to renovate the Auditorium/Theatre. 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 need for the project. <i>Comments:</i> This request should be funded in the next couple biennia to assess the renovation needs of an aging facility.</p>	8	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <i>Comments:</i> The existing facility constructed in 1922 is in fair physical condition. The building was remodeled in 1969 and had some upgrades in 2000 and 2012. Project planning should evaluate all functional problems with existing spaces.</p>	8	10

#6 PSC / Theatre Renovation Planning Continued



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 detailed space needs would be developed as part of the project's programming phase.</p>	0	0
<p>8. Types of space in the project compared to statewide role and mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This proposal affects undergraduate instructional, academic-support and public service space</p>	4	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Facility maintenance expenditures on State-supported buildings at PSC averaged 1.64% of their current replacement value for the most recent biennium.</p>	5	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> This project should not require additional State resources for new building operations and maintenance costs.</p>	3	5
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>	66.0	95
<p>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</p>	69.5%	

#8 LB 309 / Fire & Life Safety – Class II 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 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 project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities plans. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of need for the project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects are required to fully comply with fire/life safety codes to avoid potential danger to building occupants and should be addressed in the next couple of biennium.</p>	8	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <i>Comments:</i> Fire & Life Safety – Class II 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.</p>	10	10

#8 LB 309 / Fire & Life Safety – Class II Requests Continued



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 in the project compared to statewide role and mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This request will improve fire and life safety 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>	4.36	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institutions: UNK, UNL, UNO and NCTA. A weighted average of points awarded to each institution was used in awarding points for this request, of which UNK and UNO projects received less than the maximum points allowed.</p>	3.98	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
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>	57.3	85
<p>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</p>	67.5%	


#9 NSCS / Energy Master Plan



Date of Governing Board Approval: June 10, 2014
Date of Commission Approval: Not required for development of a master plan.
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> Master planning and programming requests are ranked 5th out of 10 statewide facilities categories used to evaluate overall capital construction needs.</p>	18	30
<p>2. Project contains a governing board designated "sector initiative." <i>Comments:</i> Master planning and programming requests are not specifically identified as a sector initiative by the Nebraska State College Board of Trustees for the 2015-2017 biennium.</p>	0	10
<p>3. Degree that project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities plans. <i>Comments:</i> Each of the State College's 2012 Campus Master Plan adopted by the Board of Trustees on April 20, 2012, identified the need to reduce energy consumption and the adoption of a College-wide Sustainability Plan. These Plans identify external and internal environmental trends, forecasts and assumptions that affect the State College's programs and services. The Plans do not clearly link strategic planning initiatives to the capital plan.</p>	8	10
<p>4. The immediacy of need for the project. <i>Comments:</i> This request should be funded in the next couple biennia to assess systemwide energy and sustainability issues that need to be addressed.</p>	8	10
<p>5. The quality of the existing facility as measured by its physical condition and functionality. <i>Comments:</i> The Master Plan would likely result in at least some projects similar to Energy Conservation - Class II requests that are awarded three points for this criterion.</p>	3	10

#9 NSCS / Energy Master Plan Continued



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 in the project compared to statewide role and mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This request involves all State College facilities, which include instructional and academic/student support, public service and administrative/operational space.</p>	4.6	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Facility maintenance expenditures on State-supported buildings at CSC, PSC and WSC averaged 1.31% of their current replacement value for the most recent biennium.</p>	5	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> Projects resulting from the Master Plan would likely provide some financial payback by reducing energy costs.</p>	4	5
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>	60.6	95
<p>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</p>	63.8%	

#10 LB 309 / Deferred Repair – Class II 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 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> This request does not contain a designated sector initiative.</p>	0	10
<p>3. Degree that project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities plans. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of need for the project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects are needed to correct problems that if neglected will deteriorate or projects that would partially renew a facility. Funding for these projects is needed in the next five years to prevent further deterioration of these facilities.</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 requests are awarded four points for this criterion.</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

#10 LB 309 / Deferred Repair – Class II Requests Continued



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 in the project compared to statewide role and mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This request will repair instructional, academic/student support, 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>	4.31	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institutions: UNK, UNL, UNO and NCTA. A weighted average of points awarded at each institution was used in awarding points for this request, of which only UNK and UNO projects received less than the maximum points allowed.</p>	4.46	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
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>	44.8	85
<p>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</p>	52.7%	

#11 LB 309 / Energy Conservation – Class II 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 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 project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities plans. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of need for the project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects would reduce energy expenditures. Simple payback for these projects should be between five and 10 years. Funding for these projects would be beneficial within the next few biennia.</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 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.</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 in the project compared to statewide role and mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This request will improve energy efficiencies in instructional, academic/student support, 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>	4.35	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institutions: UNK, UNL, UNO and NCTA. A weighted average of points awarded at each institution was used in awarding points for this request, of which only UNK and UNO projects received less than the maximum points allowed.</p>	4.18	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects will provide some financial payback by reducing energy costs.</p>	4	5
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>	40.5	85
<p>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</p>	47.7%	

#12 PSC Biomass Energy Center



Date of Governing Board Approval: September 10, 2010 (No State funds identified)
Date of Commission Approval: A request to review and approve this project has not been submitted.
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> Former energy conservation class 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 project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities plans. <i>Comments:</i> The PSC 2012 Campus Master Plan was adopted by the Board of Trustees on April 20, 2012. The Master Plan references a Biomass Energy Center Study and Program Statement completed in 2009, and shows a biomass plant on a site plan. The Master Plan also references a Campus-Wide Energy Audit prepared in 2012, which does not reference a biomass energy center in the executive summary. The PSC Sesquicentennial Plan 2011-2017 Progress Report as of July 31, 2013, does not identify external and internal environmental trends, forecasts and assumptions that affect the institution's programs and services. The Master Plan also does not link strategic planning initiatives as it would relate to this capital request.</p>	6	10
<p>4. The immediacy of need for the project. <i>Comments:</i> This project would reduce energy expenditures, with a simple payback of more than 20 years. Funding for this project could be considered if a revised plan could demonstrate a simple payback period of 10 years or less.</p>	1	10

#12 PSC Biomass Energy Center Continued




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> This project is similar to an Energy Conservation - Class III request, which 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 appear to unnecessarily duplicate existing campus services space based on the information available.</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.</p>	0	0
<p>8. Types of space in the project compared to statewide role and mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This request affects undergraduate instructional, student support and public service space on campus.</p>	4.58	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> Facility maintenance expenditures on State-supported buildings at PSC averaged 1.64% of their current replacement value for the most recent biennium.</p>	5	5
<p>10. The potential long-term costs (or savings) associated with a project. <i>Comments:</i> This request will provide some financial payback and are therefore awarded points similar to an Energy Conservation - Class III request.</p>	4	5
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>	42.6	95
<p>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</p>	44.8%	

#13 LB 309 / Americans with Disabilities Act – Class II 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> Americans with Disabilities Act – Class II 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 project complies with strategic and comprehensive facilities plans. <i>Comments:</i> Not applicable for this type of request.</p>	0	0
<p>4. The immediacy of need for the project. <i>Comments:</i> These projects are considered items that may be necessary to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act federal law.</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 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.</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 in the project compared to statewide role and mission priorities. <i>Comments:</i> This request will provide additional 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>	4.31	5
<p>9. Degree that the institution maintains its existing tax-supported facilities. <i>Comments:</i> This request contains projects from the following institutions: UNK, UNL, UNO and NCTA. A weighted average of points awarded at each institution was used in awarding points for this request, of which UNK and UNO projects received less than the maximum points allowed.</p>	4.46	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
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>	35.8	85
<p>PERCENTAGE OF AWARDED POINTS/MAXIMUM POINTS</p>	42.1%	

Section V - Commission Prioritization of Approved Projects



Appendix A – Institution Routine Maintenance Expenditures

Appendix A - Institution Routine Maintenance Expenditures




Routine Facility Maintenance Expenditures for the Nebraska State Colleges

October 14, 2014

Institution	Fiscal Year	Institutional Routine Maintenance Expenditures					% of CRV* Expended for Routine Maint.
		Total-General & Cash Fund Expenditures	Gen/Cash Funds Expended for Routine Maint.	% State Funds Expended for Routine Maint.	State Maint. Fac. Area (GSF)	Routine Maint. \$/GSF	
CSC							
	2009-10	\$22,841,883	\$727,851	3.19%	504,119	\$1.44	
	2010-11	\$22,997,080	\$759,079	3.30%	504,119	\$1.51	
	2011-12	\$24,648,716	\$818,633	3.32%	504,119	\$1.62	
	2012-13	\$28,114,747	\$1,060,091	3.77%	504,119	\$2.10	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$26,381,732	\$939,362	3.56%	504,119	\$1.86	1.14%
PSC							
	2009-10	\$16,549,348	\$759,312	4.59%	301,386	\$2.52	
	2010-11	\$17,549,735	\$683,870	3.90%	301,386	\$2.27	
	2011-12	\$16,365,030	\$906,403	5.54%	301,386	\$3.01	
	2012-13	\$16,050,479	\$797,034	4.97%	301,386	\$2.64	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$16,207,755	\$851,719	5.26%	301,386	\$2.83	1.64%
WSC							
	2009-10	\$31,572,249	\$877,797	2.78%	608,648	\$1.44	
	2010-11	\$31,295,847	\$805,638	2.57%	608,648	\$1.32	
	2011-12	\$31,037,061	\$1,463,879	4.72%	630,913	\$2.32	
	2012-13	\$31,898,700	\$1,095,951	3.44%	630,913	\$1.74	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$31,467,881	\$1,279,915	4.07%	630,913	\$2.03	1.28%
State College Totals							
	2009-10	\$70,963,480	\$2,364,960	3.33%	1,414,153	\$1.67	
	2010-11	\$71,842,662	\$2,248,587	3.13%	1,414,153	\$1.59	
	2011-12	\$72,050,807	\$3,188,915	4.43%	1,436,418	\$2.22	
	2012-13	\$76,063,926	\$2,953,076	3.88%	1,436,418	\$2.06	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$74,057,367	\$3,070,996	4.15%	1,436,418	\$2.14	1.31%

* Recommended expenditures on routine maint. (approx. 1% of Current Replacement Value): **\$2,348,528**

Appendix A - Institution Routine Maintenance Expenditures



Routine Facility Maintenance Expenditures for the University of Nebraska

October 14, 2014

Institution	Fiscal Year	Institutional Routine Maintenance Expenditures					
		Total-General & Cash Fund Expenditures	Gen/Cash Funds Expended for Routine Maint.	% State Funds Expended for Routine Maint.	State Maint. Fac. Area (GSF)	Routine Maint. \$/GSF	% of CRV* Expended for Routine Maint.
UNK							
	2009-10	\$55,328,898	\$990,101	1.79%	1,066,838	\$0.93	
	2010-11	\$58,583,141	\$1,122,055	1.92%	1,066,838	\$1.05	
	2011-12	\$59,718,748	\$1,077,413	1.80%	1,066,838	\$1.01	
	2012-13	\$61,940,902	\$1,011,924	1.63%	1,066,838	\$0.95	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$60,829,825	\$1,044,669	1.72%	1,066,838	\$0.98	0.44%
UNL							
	2009-10	\$360,956,440	\$7,307,616	2.02%	6,770,330	\$1.08	
	2010-11	\$406,382,898	\$6,856,361	1.69%	6,951,575	\$0.99	
	2011-12	\$391,026,428	\$7,540,764	1.93%	6,971,157	\$1.08	
	2012-13	\$415,120,741	\$8,643,657	2.08%	6,934,535	\$1.25	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$403,073,585	\$8,092,211	2.01%	6,952,846	\$1.16	0.53%
UNMC							
	2009-10	\$198,929,722	\$4,756,590	2.39%	2,087,572	\$2.28	
	2010-11	\$209,001,008	\$4,762,911	2.28%	2,131,229	\$2.23	
	2011-12	\$218,899,104	\$4,765,593	2.18%	2,224,968	\$2.14	
	2012-13	\$222,585,320	\$5,514,882	2.48%	2,224,968	\$2.48	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$220,742,212	\$5,140,238	2.33%	2,224,968	\$2.31	0.94%
UNO							
	2009-10	\$108,116,001	\$1,390,206	1.29%	1,733,994	\$0.80	
	2010-11	\$113,546,197	\$2,125,646	1.87%	1,857,090	\$1.14	
	2011-12	\$115,456,144	\$1,684,192	1.46%	1,857,090	\$0.91	
	2012-13	\$123,205,723	\$1,870,953	1.52%	1,853,907	\$1.01	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$119,330,934	\$1,777,573	1.49%	1,855,499	\$0.96	0.45%
University Totals							
	2009-10	\$723,331,061	\$14,444,513	2.00%	11,658,734	\$1.24	
	2010-11	\$787,513,244	\$14,866,973	1.89%	12,006,732	\$1.24	
	2011-12	\$785,100,424	\$15,067,962	1.92%	12,120,053	\$1.24	
	2012-13	\$822,852,686	\$17,041,416	2.07%	12,080,248	\$1.41	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$803,976,555	\$16,054,689	2.00%	12,100,151	\$1.33	0.59%

* Recommended expenditures on routine maint. (approx. 1% of Current Replacement Value): \$27,093,511

Appendix A - Institution Routine Maintenance Expenditures



Routine Facility Maintenance Expenditures for the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture at Curtis

October 14, 2014

Institutional Routine Maintenance Expenditures							
Institution	Fiscal Year	Total-General & Cash Fund Expenditures	Gen/Cash Funds Expended for Routine Maint.	% State Funds Expended for Routine Maint.	State Maint. Fac. Area (GSF)	Routine Maint. \$/GSF	% of CRV* Expended for Routine Maint.
NCTA							
	2009-10	\$3,254,813	\$269,286	8.27%	171,624	\$1.57	
	2010-11	\$3,568,605	\$261,852	7.34%	170,464	\$1.54	
	2011-12	\$3,428,480	\$164,473	4.80%	196,904	\$0.84	
	2012-13	\$3,656,478	\$173,232	4.74%	196,904	\$0.88	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$3,542,479	\$168,853	4.77%	196,904	\$0.86	0.59%


* Recommended expenditures on routine maint. (approx. 1% of Current Replacement Value): **\$286,257**

Appendix A - Institution Routine Maintenance Expenditures



Appendix B – Institution Deferred Repair Expenditures

Appendix B - Institution Deferred Repair Expenditures




Institutional Expenditures on Deferred Repair for the Nebraska State Colleges

October 14, 2014

Institutional Deferred Repair Expenditures							
Institution	Fiscal Year	Total-General & Cash Fund Expenditures	Gen/Cash Funds Expended for Deferred Repair	% State Funds Expended for Deferred Repair	State Maint. Fac. Area (GSF)	Deferred Repair \$/GSF	% of CRV* Expended for Deferred Repair
CSC							
	2009-10	\$22,841,883	\$251,432	1.10%	504,119	\$0.50	
	2010-11	\$22,997,080	\$1,493	0.01%	504,119	\$0.00	
	2011-12	\$24,648,716	\$0	0.00%	504,119	\$0.00	
	2012-13	\$28,114,747	\$0	0.00%	504,119	\$0.00	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$26,381,732	\$0	0.00%	504,119	\$0.00	0.00%
PSC							
	2009-10	\$16,549,348	\$16,936	0.10%	301,386	\$0.06	
	2010-11	\$17,549,735	\$145,680	0.83%	301,386	\$0.48	
	2011-12	\$16,365,030	\$0	0.00%	301,386	\$0.00	
	2012-13	\$16,050,479	\$0	0.00%	301,386	\$0.00	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$16,207,755	\$0	0.00%	301,386	\$0.00	0.00%
WSC							
	2009-10	\$31,572,249	\$16,393	0.05%	608,648	\$0.03	
	2010-11	\$31,295,847	\$17,773	0.06%	608,648	\$0.03	
	2011-12	\$31,037,061	\$0	0.00%	630,913	\$0.00	
	2012-13	\$31,898,700	\$0	0.00%	630,913	\$0.00	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$31,467,881	\$0	0.00%	630,913	\$0.00	0.00%
State College Totals							
	2009-10	\$70,963,480	\$284,761	0.40%	1,414,153	\$0.20	
	2010-11	\$71,842,662	\$164,946	0.23%	1,414,153	\$0.12	
	2011-12	\$72,050,807	\$0	0.00%	1,436,418	\$0.00	
	2012-13	\$76,063,926	\$0	0.00%	1,436,418	\$0.00	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$74,057,367	\$0	0.00%	1,436,418	\$0.00	0.00%

* Recommended expenditures on deferred repair (approx. 0.25% of Current Replacement Value): **\$587,132**

Appendix B - Institution Deferred Repair Expenditures



Institutional Expenditures on Deferred Repair for the University of Nebraska							
October 14, 2014							
Institutional Deferred Repair Expenditures							
Institution	Fiscal Year	Total-General & Cash Fund Expenditures	Gen/Cash Funds Expended for Deferred Repair	% State Funds Expended for Deferred Repair	State Maint. Fac. Area (GSF)	Deferred Repair \$/GSF	% of CRV* Expended for Deferred Repair
UNK							
	2009-10	\$55,328,898	\$0	0.00%	1,066,838	\$0.00	
	2010-11	\$58,583,141	\$0	0.00%	1,066,838	\$0.00	
	2011-12	\$59,718,748	\$0	0.00%	1,066,838	\$0.00	
	2012-13	\$61,940,902	\$0	0.00%	1,066,838	\$0.00	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$60,829,825	\$0	0.00%	1,066,838	\$0.00	0.00%
UNL							
	2009-10	\$360,956,440	\$2,428,378	0.67%	6,770,330	\$0.36	
	2010-11	\$406,382,898	\$1,967,811	0.48%	6,951,575	\$0.28	
	2011-12	\$391,026,428	\$1,763,351	0.45%	6,971,157	\$0.25	
	2012-13	\$415,120,741	\$3,433,349	0.83%	6,934,535	\$0.50	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$403,073,585	\$2,598,350	0.64%	6,952,846	\$0.37	0.17%
UNMC							
	2009-10	\$198,929,722	\$1,270,737	0.64%	2,087,572	\$0.61	
	2010-11	\$209,001,008	\$946,230	0.45%	2,131,229	\$0.44	
	2011-12	\$218,899,104	\$1,280,362	0.58%	2,224,968	\$0.58	
	2012-13	\$222,585,320	\$915,367	0.41%	2,224,968	\$0.41	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$220,742,212	\$1,097,865	0.50%	2,224,968	\$0.49	0.20%
UNO							
	2009-10	\$108,116,001	\$422,792	0.39%	1,733,994	\$0.24	
	2010-11	\$113,546,197	\$1,157,601	1.02%	1,857,090	\$0.62	
	2011-12	\$115,456,144	\$398,080	0.34%	1,857,090	\$0.21	
	2012-13	\$123,205,723	\$663,400	0.54%	1,853,907	\$0.36	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$119,330,934	\$530,740	0.44%	1,855,499	\$0.29	0.13%
University Totals							
	2009-10	\$723,331,061	\$4,121,907	0.57%	11,658,734	\$0.35	
	2010-11	\$787,513,244	\$4,071,642	0.52%	12,006,732	\$0.34	
	2011-12	\$785,100,424	\$3,441,793	0.44%	12,120,053	\$0.28	
	2012-13	\$822,852,686	\$5,012,116	0.61%	12,080,248	\$0.41	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$803,976,555	\$4,226,955	0.53%	12,100,151	\$0.35	0.16%

* Recommended expenditures on deferred repair (approx. 0.25% of Current Replacement Value): **\$6,773,378**

Appendix B - Institution Deferred Repair Expenditures



Institutional Expenditures on Deferred Repair for the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture at Curtis

October 14, 2014

Institutional Deferred Repair Expenditures							
Institution	Fiscal Year	Total-General & Cash Fund Expenditures	Gen/Cash Funds Expended for Deferred Repair	% State Funds Expended for Deferred Repair	State Maint. Fac. Area (GSF)	Deferred Repair \$/GSF	% of CRV* Expended for Deferred Repair
NCTA	2009-10	\$3,254,813	\$0	0.00%	171,624	\$0.00	
	2010-11	\$3,568,605	\$0	0.00%	170,464	\$0.00	
	2011-12	\$3,428,480	\$0	0.00%	196,904	\$0.00	
	2012-13	\$3,656,478	\$0	0.00%	196,904	\$0.00	
	2-Yr. Avg.	\$3,542,479	\$0	0.00%	196,904	\$0.00	0.00%

* Recommended expenditures on deferred repair (approx. 0.25% of Current Replacement Value): **\$71,564**

Appendix B - Institution Deferred Repair Expenditures



Appendix C – 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 - Requests to repair structural or mechanical defects that would endanger the integrity of a building, utility system or their components or allow the unwanted penetration of a building or system by the outdoor elements. Requests for funding of deferred repair projects are divided into two classes:

Class I - Items for immediate action to avoid unwanted penetration of a building by outdoor elements and to avoid costly damage to a building, utility system or their components. If these projects are not addressed, it could very possibly stop a program or a service from being

achieved due to a building or utility 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.

Fire/Life-Safety - Requests to correct or repair structural, mechanical, or other defects in a building or its components, or utility systems that endanger the lives or health of state employees or the general public. Such requests bring the facilities, components, or utility systems into compliance with current fire safety, life safety, and hazardous materials abatement requirements, and provide a safer structural environment. Requests for funding to provide fire/life-safety improvements are divided into two classes:

Class I - Building or utility system changes/modifications that are required to rectify a situation where the health and well-being of the occupants of a building are immediately, directly, and clearly imperiled, or where local, state or federal code officials have determined certain fire/life-safety improvements are needed

immediately in order to ensure the safety of building occupants or users.

Class II - Other building changes/modifications that may be necessary to comply with fire/life safety codes and to avoid potential danger to the health and safety of the building occupants.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) - Requests provide building and program accessibility for disabled and physically challenged individuals and bring a building into compliance with the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design (2010 ADA). Requests should be limited to structural modifications to buildings or other requests normally handled through the capital construction process. Minor pieces of equipment, computer modifications, and other non-capital items should be included in the operating budget request. Requests for funding to provide accessibility for the disabled and physically challenged are divided into two classes:

Class I - Structural changes/modifications that have been clearly found to be necessary to comply with the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design (2010 ADA) or which have


been deemed necessary by physically challenged individuals in order to work or gain program access in a facility.

Class II - Other structural changes or modifications that may be necessary to comply with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) federal law.

Energy Conservation - Requests whose primary emphasis is the reduction of energy consumption by a building, utility system or their components. The objectives of the conservation request, along with financing options, should be included in requested projects. Requests for funding of energy conservation projects are divided into two classes:

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. Simple payback should be five (5) years or less.

Appendix C - Definitions



Class II - Items that if not addressed will create an additional strain on energy resources and which if accomplished would result in operating expenditure reductions. Simple payback should be five (5) to ten (10) years.

Appendix C – Definitions

