

Agenda
Board of Regents
Facilities and Land Management Committee
Thursday, June 3, 2010; *3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Room 106 Lee Gorsuch Commons
University of Alaska Anchorage
Anchorage, Alaska

**Times for meetings are subject to modifications within the June 3-4, 2010 timeframe.*

Committee Members:

Timothy Brady, Committee Chair
Carl Marrs, Committee Vice Chair
Mary K. Hughes

Robert Martin
Kirk Wickersham
Cynthia Henry, Board Chair

I. Call to Order

II. Adoption of Agenda

MOTION

"The Facilities and Land Management Committee adopts the agenda as presented.

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Adoption of Agenda**
- III. Full Board Consent Agenda**
 - A. Project Approval – Tanana Valley Campus Center Space Revitalization Phase 4**
 - B. Project Approval – Engineering Planning**
 - C. Adoption of UAF Campus Master Plan**
 - D. Adoption of UAA Community Campus Master Plans**
- IV. New Business**
 - A. Schematic Design Approval – Critical Electric Upgrade Phase 1B**
 - B. Schematic Design Approval – UAF Arctic Health Research Greenhouse**
- V. Ongoing Issues**
 - A. Report on Kenai Peninsula College Student Housing**
 - B. Report on Formal Project Approval for Community Campus Planning**
 - C. Report on UAA Sports Facilities and Access Road**
 - D. IT Report to include IT Security**
 - E. Construction in Progress**
- VI. Future Agenda Items**
- VII. Adjourn**

This motion is effective June 3, 2010."

III. Full Board Consent Agenda

- A. Project Approval – Tanana Valley Campus Center Space Revitalization Phase 4 Reference 12

The President recommends that:

MOTION

“The Facilities and Land Management Committee recommends the Board of Regents approve the Formal Project Approval request for the University of Alaska Fairbanks, UAF TVCC Revitalization Phase 4 – Third Floor Renewal as presented in compliance with the campus master plan, and authorizes the university administration to proceed through Schematic Design not to exceed a Total Project Cost of \$4,830,300. This motion is effective June 3, 2010.”

POLICY CITATION

In accordance with Regents’ Policy 05.12.042, Formal Project Approval (FPA) represents approval of the Project including the program justification and need, scope, the Total Project Cost (TPC), and funding plan for the project. It also represents authorization to complete the development of the project through the schematic design, targeting the approved scope and budget, unless otherwise designated by the approval authority.

The level of approval required shall be based upon TPC as follows:

- **TPC > \$4 million will require approval by the Board based on recommendations from the Facilities and Land Management Committee (F&LMC).**
- TPC > \$2 million but ≤ \$4 million will require approval by the F&LMC.
- TPC > \$1 million but ≤ \$2 million will require approval by the Chairperson of the F&LMC.
- TPC ≤ \$1 million will require approval by the university’s Chief Finance Officer (CFO) or designee.

RATIONALE AND RECOMMENDATION

Background

The Tanana Valley Campus Center at 604 Barnette Street in Fairbanks, Alaska (formerly the Fairbanks Courthouse) was designed and constructed in 1962-63. The building has four stories plus a mechanical penthouse

with a total of 78,504 gross square feet. The Court System initiated a feasibility study of the building in 1995-96 that identified functional inadequacies for the Court System and building construction deficiencies in general. In 2002, the University conducted a Utilization Feasibility Study which showed high potential for use of the 604 Barnette facility to accommodate University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) Tanana Valley Campus (TVC) space needs. The Court System vacated the building in 2003, and transferred ownership to the University of Alaska.

The original Tanana Valley Space Relocation Phase 1 move-in project was \$2,000,000 funded from the 2002 GO Bond. The project was designed and constructed in 2003. The project programmed the entire four story facility and developed concepts for various degrees of renovation based upon total need and funding potential. The original project completed basic architectural upgrades to floors one and two including communications hub rooms on four floors.

Two additional projects in 2004 and 2005 were funded by the Alaska Denali Commission and focused on TVC Allied Health programs on the fourth floor. The 2004 project, funded at \$1,000,000, completed a dental teaching suite, clinic style medical treatment labs and faculty offices. The 2005 project, funded at \$500,000, completed a computer classroom, a general classroom, and a four bed nursing lab. Completing the fourth floor programmed space for the Allied Health programs is currently estimated at \$4,300,000.

The UAF TVCC Revitalization Phase 2 Primary Ventilation Fan and Electrical Service project was \$4,000,000 funded from the Fiscal Year 2007 HB381 Tobacco Bonds. The project installed a new, larger ventilation supply fan, reused a significant portion of the existing ductwork, provided additional cooling capacity, and installed a new electrical service entrance, a new electrical main distribution panel, and new electrical circuit panels in the building interior. Completing this infrastructure component reduced the need for reworking various systems as future renovations take place. This project provided a reasonable level of comfort and code compliant air volumes to the building occupants in all seasons.

The UAF TVCC Revitalization Phase 3 Exterior Envelope Replacement project was \$7,400,000 funded from Fiscal Year 2009 Capital Appropriation and UAF Operating Funds. The project replaced the entire exterior building envelope. The new exterior includes modern high performance thermal pane windows and an R31 rated exterior wall system that will stand up to the rigorous weather in Fairbanks, Alaska. The new

exterior envelope is an energy efficient assembly that is already showing significant energy savings.

Remaining renovations of the entire facility are estimated at approximately \$19,300,000. Remaining renovation includes the third floor renewal, proposed by this approval request, and completion of the fourth floor Allied Health area, elevator replacement, complete replacement of exterior parking, first and second floor interior architectural finishes, and mechanical and electrical systems. Phasing the renovation as funding becomes available requires attention to sequencing so that previous upgrades are incorporated into subsequent projects with minimal loss of effort.

Project Scope

The UAF Tanana Valley Campus Center (TVCC) Third Floor Renewal will provide suitable space to further consolidate TVC programs into the TVCC Barnette Street location. Third floor space programming and design will identify space to house the TVC Computer CIOS & ITS programs, Construction Management and Construction Drafting CM/DRT programs, and the TVC IT Operational Support section which are currently located in leased space. The intent will remain to identify dedicated space needs for the listed programs and to establish flexible general classroom space to maximize utilization of the available space. The project includes an upgraded fire alarm system and incidental mechanical and electrical work.

Renewal of the entire third floor is currently estimated at \$6,000,000. The anticipated project funding of \$4,830,300 will fund partial renovation of the third floor to house the programs listed above.

Variance Report

None

Proposed Cost and Funding Source(s)

FY11 SB230 Capital Appropriation	\$4,830,300
----------------------------------	-------------

Estimated Maintenance and Operating Costs (M&O)

Maintenance costs overall should remain the same or decrease by virtue of combining these groups into a single facility. Lease savings will be transferred to cover the M&O costs.

Procurement Method

Design/bid/build

Schedule

DESIGN

Formal Project Approval request June 2010

Schematic Design Approval request September 2010

BID AND AWARD

Advertise October 2010

Award November 2010

CONSTRUCTION

Construction contract award December 2010

Start of Construction December 2010

Beneficial Occupancy May 2011

Consultant(s)

Design Alaska, Inc. of Fairbanks, Alaska is the design consultant for this project.

Other Cost Considerations

None

Backfill Plan

None required. Leased space is being vacated.

Affirmation

This project complies with Regents' Policy, the campus master plan and the project pre-design statement.

Supporting Documents

Budget

Concept Document

- B. Project Approval – Engineering Planning Reference 13

The President recommends that:

MOTION

“The Facilities and Land Management Committee recommends that the Board of Regents approve the Formal Project Approval request for the University of Alaska Engineering Projects as presented in compliance with the UAA and UAF campus master plans, and authorizes the university administration to proceed with project development in compliance with the UA Academic Master Plan through Schematic Design not to exceed a cost of \$10,000,000 for both projects. This motion is effective June 3, 2010.”

POLICY CITATION

In accordance with Regents' Policy 05.12.042, Formal Project Approval (FPA) represents approval of the Project including the program justification and need, scope, the Total Project Cost (TPC), and funding plan for the project. It also represents authorization to complete the development of the project through the schematic design, targeting the approved scope and budget, unless otherwise designated by the approval authority.

The level of approval required shall be based upon TPC as follows:

- **TPC > \$4 million will require approval by the Board based on recommendations from the Facilities and Land Management Committee (F&LMC).**
- TPC > \$2 million but \leq \$4 million will require approval by the F&LMC.
- TPC > \$1 million but \leq \$2 million will require approval by the Chairperson of the F&LMC.
- TPC \leq \$1 million will require approval by the university's Chief Finance Officer (CFO) or designee.

RATIONALE AND RECOMMENDATION

Planning and design funding for the construction of UAA and UAF Engineering facilities enables the university to expand engineering programs to address the state need for additional engineers. Larger engineering programs will contribute to achieving the target of graduating 200 engineers per year, and provide research and job training to benefit Alaska's construction, gas, oil, mining, and other industries. The existing engineering buildings are more than 30 years old, undersized and do not contain appropriate labs for undergraduate programs. A critical need exists for expanded teaching and research laboratory space as programs on both campuses continue to grow.

It is the intent of this project that a joint program statement will be developed for these facilities which sets forth the space needed at each campus to accomplish the academic priorities for engineering in compliance with the UA Academic Master Plan. Separate project agreements will be developed for each campus's project and separate SDA requests will be submitted to the board by each MAU.

A report will be made to the Facilities and Land Management Committee at every meeting on the progress of this project development.

BACKGROUND FOR UAA

UAA engineering is experiencing dramatic growth in its enrollments with a near doubling of the entire program in the past five years now at nearly 1,000 students. New baccalaureate engineering and related associate and certificate programs were created to meet industry demand and have been one of the driving forces for the enrollment increases. The existing engineering building was built in the early 1980s and is currently undersized. Two sites are being considered. One site is north of the existing Engineering Building and would require the realignment of Mallard Lane into its existing right of way. The other site is directly south of the Bookstore and would connect with the new Health Sciences Building across Providence Drive. Both sites will be investigated and reviewed as part of the planning process.

The UAA Master Plan approved by the Board of Regents in June 2004 called for an additional 21,600 gsf of space to meet the needs of the Engineering Program as it was configured at that time to meet the demands for additional specialty space requirements. School of Engineering and Facilities Planning and Construction conducted a study to determine the requirements needed to satisfy new program growth. Based on this study, the programmatic need for the School of Engineering calls for space in addition to the campus master plan requirement. This additional space would be comprised of classrooms, instructional laboratories, educational shops and office space to accommodate the high demand for engineers in Alaska.

This project would accommodate existing program requirements and allow for the consolidation of Engineering Programs currently being taught elsewhere on and off campus.

UAA's FY11 request of \$50M is for programming, building design and construction, of a 50,000 gsf Engineering lab facility and structured parking for the building requirements. If there was no growth in the Engineering Program, this would provide 96 gsf per student. The legislature appropriated \$5,000,000 in FY11 for programming and design. If Governor Parnell approves the capital appropriation, UAA will request that the board include the construction funds in FY12.

Proposed Total Project Cost and Funding Plan

Total project cost:	\$50,000,000
Funding Source:	
Planning & Design - FY11 Capital Budget	\$5,000,000
Construction - FY12 Capital Budget	\$45,000,000

Estimated Annual Maintenance and Operating Costs (O&M)

Utilities	\$ 260,000
Grounds & Landscaping	\$ 45,000
M & R	\$ 441,000
Other	\$ 35,000
Custodial	<u>\$ 45,000</u>
Total	\$826,000 / year

Consultant(s)

A Request for Proposal (RFP) will be issued for selection of a consultant.

Other Cost Considerations

The School of Engineering has spent over \$500,000 this fiscal year for the use of temporary facilities including two 1,000 gsf portable buildings located north of the Engineering Building; rental of a warehouse off campus for use as a design studio; and the temporary reallocation of the University Lakes Building (ULB) Annex occupants to accommodate Engineering program needs. The State of Alaska moved out of the ULB Annex space in late July 2009 with the original intent of having University Police and IT system backup to occupy this space. These dispersed facilities (on and off campus) provide about 14K gsf to help meet the current program needs, but are extremely inefficient for effective program delivery and still provide less square feet per student than peer institutions.

Backfill Plan

This space does not currently exist on campus. Some relief in the Engineering Building would occur as labs are multipurpose but equipment is insufficient for the program needs and will need to be purchased.

Proposed Schedule for Completion

PROGRAMMING

Development of joint program statement August 2010

DESIGN

Conceptual Design Update as necessary September 2010

Formal Project Approval June 2010 (Pending)

Schematic Design November 2010

Schematic Design Approval December 2010

Construction Documents April 2011

BID & AWARD

Advertise and Bid May/June 2011

Construction Contract Award July 2011

CONSTRUCTION

Start of Construction August 2011

Date of Beneficial Occupancy January 2013

Procurement Method for Construction

UAA is analyzing the construction procurement to determine the delivery method that provides the best value for the university on such a high value and complex project. A preferred procurement method will be identified during schematic design phase.

Affirmation

This project complies with Regents' Policy and the 2004 campus master plan as amended.

Action Requested

Approval to program the facility in accordance with the UA Academic Master Plan, and develop the UAA project documents through schematic design.

Supporting Documents

Project Budget

Engineering Needs Study – September 2009

BACKGROUND FOR UAF

UAF has always been on the forefront of engineering research and teaching in support of Alaska's resource development. As one of two of the oldest degree programs in the state, UAF's College of Engineering and Mines has a proud history of teaching and research in Alaska, pioneering many of the projects that benefit every Alaskan. Preparing today's engineers for tomorrow's jobs on the gas line is key to keeping that pioneering spirit moving Alaska forward and keeping local talent employed during construction of the new gas line. This much-needed project will provide space for labs and classrooms to teach future pipeline designers and research innovative materials that will save the state during construction.

Since the combination of the School of Engineering and the School of Mineral Engineering into the College of Engineering and Mines (CEM), space in the Duckering Building has become short in supply, high in demand. Since 2002, enrollment at UAF CEM has increased by 75% and the incoming freshman enrollment jumped by 95% in the fall of 2007. The quantifiable and useable space available for engineering students has significantly decreased over those years, dipping well below the national average for engineering schools.

Duckering is also the home of the Institute of Northern Engineering, the research leg of the engineering programs on campus. Over the last eight years, research revenue has grown by 400% with no growth of the

building. Lab space for environmental and petroleum research is over taxed and not adequate to provide the latest innovations for the oil and gas industry.

Project Scope

A critical need exists for expanded teaching and research laboratory space as both programs continue to grow and expand. Completion of a new engineering facility project will address the needs of continued growth in engineering academics, research, and job training for future engineers to benefit Alaska's construction, critical infrastructure, and the oil, mining, and gas industries. This project will be the single most important key to meeting the State's demand of doubling the number of graduating engineers by 2012.

In 2007, the College of Engineering and Mines (CEM) quickly identified the need for additional facility space for their expanding undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral student degree programs and research grants. Though the goal in their academic plan was to double enrollment over a five year period, it essentially happened in one year (a 95% increase Fall 2007 alone). To better understand how enrollment trends and program goals were being affected by a lack of space, CEM and UAF Facilities Services analyzed the current engineering building and identified a real need for additional space.

In 2008, CEM and UAF Facilities Services (FS), working with the consulting firm of Bezek, Durst, Seiser Inc of Anchorage, first began the space needs assessment by performing a utilization study of current assigned engineering space. The utilization study identified and recommended better, more efficient use of some existing classrooms and class labs, found spaces that were over utilized (or exceeded code allowed occupancy loads), and suggested some relocations to better achieve program space adjacencies. The report also identified over 30,000 gross square feet research lab needs from recently awarded grants that were not being met in the existing building. Overall, through working with each program's dean, director, and faculty, FS has formulated suggestions for better space utilization that can accommodate a small percentage of the current enrollment growth.

After gathering the current and projected growth figures, a space program was developed to fully utilize the current facility. Through reallocation of existing space, approximately 25% of the engineering space program needs were addressed by the current building. Additional space must be constructed to meet the remaining program requirements.

UAF's utilization study and concept planning for a new facility were based conservatively on current academic enrollment trends and programmatic goals.

- Incoming First-Time Enrolled Freshmen between 2002 and 2009 increased 140% which includes a 240% increase in enrolled UA Scholars.
- For Fall 2008 to 2009, overall enrollment increased 25% and 20% respectively: Graduate applications and admissions increased 70%.
- Between Fall Semester 2002 and Fall 2009, engineering enrollment has increased by 75% (409 total enrolled to 714 total enrolled).
- State and UA Goal is to double the number of graduating engineers between 2006 and 2012.
- Construct new, separate research facility for newest endeavors, UAF's Alaska Center for Energy and Power (Project ETWP).
- Increase utilization of existing Duckering Building by 25%.
- To remain competitive on national level, increase assignable square footage per student from 70 square feet per FTE to 105 square feet per FTE.

After presenting various components of this information to CEM and the UAF Administration and based on the trends and goals of the academic plan, the preferred solution for accommodating the space requirements is:

- o Construct a single "legacy" type facility for Engineering adjacent to the current engineering building. The facility would be modest in size due to the amount of existing space in the Duckering Building.
- o Reallocate space in the existing Duckering building, with cost associated for renovations and change of use within the total project cost of the expansion.

To accommodate the program needs and academic plan, UAF proposes to construct approximately 70,000 gross square feet (gsf) of new space and renovate/reallocate an additional 40,000 gsf of the existing 150,000 gsf Duckering Building. The new facility will be constructed along Tanana Loop, adjacent to the existing facility to take full advantage of adjacencies. Sophomore, Junior, and Senior Engineering students will spend most of their academic year in the engineering complex and proximity of classrooms, laboratories, and faculty offices creates the best learning environment. The new building will feature several medium classrooms, a university wide programmatic need. The space will also house one entire engineering department, several teaching labs, and support spaces. Finally, a large engineering fabrication and structures testing lab will be created that will allow engineering student to construct larger bridge projects and steel and concrete research specimens.

Site planning has been completed and adheres to the goals and objectives of the UAF Master Plan 2010 (Site E). An existing facility on the site will be demolished and the existing user group will be relocated to space on the Fairbanks campus.

In the existing Duckering facility, space will be reallocated and renovated to better cluster departments together. Through proper reallocation, the utilization of the building will increase, thus reducing the need for a larger engineering facility expansion. The final concept plan is conservative, accommodating only current enrollment growth at approximately 105 asf per full-time enrolled engineering student.

Variance Report

The FPA represents a slight variance from the Preliminary Administrative Approval. The overall space impacted (new and reallocated) has increased to 110,000 gsf.

Proposed Total Project Cost and Funding Source(s)

FY11 State of Alaska Capital Appropriation	\$5,000,000
FY12 State of Alaska Capital Appropriation (request)	<u>\$58,000,000</u>
Total Project Cost	\$63,000,000

The FY11 SOA Capital funding will be used immediately to advance the design of the project to a Schematic Design level in anticipation of construction funding by July 2011.

Estimated Annual Maintenance and Operating Costs (O&M)

Based on the new square footage only, the M&O cost are estimated for FY14 building opening.

Utilities	\$426,400
Custodial	\$174,100
Trash/Grounds	\$37,300
M&R	\$909,600 (full M&R cost)

Consultant(s)

A consulting firm will be contracted after a publicly advertised request for proposal upon receipt of the capital funding.

Other Cost Considerations

Due to the demolition of the existing facility on the site, there will be a reduction in the University's M&O cost of \$139,600.

Backfill Plan

Through the relocation of one department into the new expansion space and subsequent reallocation of space in the existing engineering space, various engineering departments will backfill to vacated space in Duckering to accommodate enrollment growth.

Schedule for Completion

PROGRAMMING

Development of joint program statement August 2010

DESIGN

Conceptual Design Update as necessary September 2010

Formal Project Approval June, 2010

Schematic Design November 2010

Schematic Design Approval December 2010

Construction Documents June 2011

BID & AWARD

Advertise and Bid August 2011

Construction Contract Award September 2011

CONSTRUCTION

Start of Construction October 2011

Date of Beneficial Occupancy December 2013

Procurement Method for Construction

UAF is analyzing the construction procurement to determine the delivery method that provides the best value for the University on such a high value and complex project. A preferred procurement method will be identified during Schematic Design phase.

Affirmation

This project complies with Regents' Policy, the campus master plan and the project agreement.

Action Requested

Approval to program the facility in accordance with the UA Academic Master Plan, and develop the UAF project documents through schematic design.

Supporting Documents

--One Page Budget

--Space Program

--Site Plan for Expansion

--Aerial View of Expansion

C. Adoption of UAF Campus Master Plan

The President recommends that:

MOTION

“The Facilities and Land Management Committee recommends that the Board of Regents adopt the University of Alaska Fairbanks Campus Master Plan as presented. This motion is effective June 3, 2010.”

POLICY CITATION

Regents’ Policy 05.12.030.A - Campus Master Plans, states: The administration will develop and present to the board for adoption, a campus master plan for each campus. The purpose of a campus master plan is to provide a framework for implementation of the academic, strategic and capital plans. In accordance with the referenced policy, the campus master plan will be reviewed and updated on a five to seven year cycle (update due 2015-2017).

RATIONALE AND RECOMMENDATION

Background

UAF’s current Campus Master Plan was adopted in 2002. The Board of Regents approved a new Campus Master Plan Policy (05.12.030) in September 2008. UAF’s new 2010 plan complies with this policy.

The UAF Campus Master Plan 2010 process began in July 2009, has included significant public input, including forums, meetings and presentations, and has followed the original schedule concluding with the request for adoption by the Board of Regents in June 2010.

Revisions

Following input received from the Board of Regents’ Facilities and Land Management Committee, UA administrators, UAF Chancellor’s Cabinet, UAF Master Planning Committee and a detailed review and edit by the UAF Master Planning Steering Committee, the following are revisions to the plan since the April 2010 draft that are of particular importance:

- A 10-year enrollment projection has been included
- Photographs inserted throughout CMP (were not included in the April draft)
- Inclusion of Chancellor’s Message
- Clarification to section on Guidelines
- Clarification of demolition plan for existing facilities

- Inclusion of a reference that locates core requirements of the CMP Policy in the UAF CMP
- Detailed discussion of core requirements of CMP Policy and how the UAF CMP meets the requirements included in appendix
- Clarification to charts in Section 2
- Narrative on land acquisition and disposal clarified

Affirmation

This UAF Campus Master Plan complies with Regents' Policy 05.12.030.

Action Requested

Approval of UAF Campus Master Plan 2010

D. Adoption of UAA Community Campus Master Plans

The President recommends that:

MOTION

“The Facilities and Land Management Committee recommends that the Board of Regents adopt the 2010 UAA Community Campus Master Plans as presented with the understanding that UAA will begin a community campus master plan update process in three to five years. This motion is effective June 3, 2010.”

POLICY CITATION

Regents' Policy 05.12.030. Campus Master Plans, states: The administration will develop and present to the board for adoption, a campus master plan for each campus. The purpose of a campus master plan is to provide a framework for implementation of the academic, strategic and capital plans.

RATIONALE AND RECOMMENDATION

UAA community campuses do not currently have adopted Master Plans and would benefit from having adopted plans.

Campus plan development requires significant investment of staff and fiscal resources. Significant time and effort has been invested by staff and community leaders in developing the plans. The plans address the campus history and regional context looking at projected areas of sustainable growth; document existing condition of the campus; incorporate the institution, MAU and campus strategic and academic vision; and conclude with recommendations for the campus future development.

Background:

After the 2004 approval of the UAA Campus Master Plan, UAA engaged a consultant (ZGF) to prepare the Master Plan for Kodiak College. A final draft of the Kodiak plan was completed prior to adoption of the new policy for master plans, but UAA has chosen to revise it to address changes in Kodiak administration and Regents' Policy. Originally UAA's approach was to complete one community campus master plan and to use it as a template for the others.

In early 2008, it became apparent that the community campuses desired to develop their own master plans sooner than such a process would permit. At that point, UAA engaged Anchorage-based Land Design North (LDN) to develop plans for the remaining community campuses (PWSCC, MatSu, and Kenai Peninsula College with Kachemak Bay). As a result, there are two formats: the plan for Kodiak College and the plans for the other campuses. After board adoption of the new campus master plan policy, the strategy changed to seeking approval of the Community Campus plans after seeking adoption of the 2009 Anchorage campus plan update.

During the summer of 2009, the community campus plans were reworked to incorporate the Fall 2008 policy. The plans now address the twelve required elements. A recent review has updated student and faculty projections and made minor corrections to improve the plans without undertaking a major rewrite.

All of the Community Campus Master plans were collaboratively developed using an iterative process. The Project Manager and the Consultants met with the campus leadership, community members, staff, faculty and students for input. All plans document the campus mission and role in the UA system.

At the December 2009 board meeting, the Cover, Table of Contents and Introduction for each of the current master plan drafts were presented to the board with the intent of providing a sense of the plan. UAA provided the final draft document for each campus on a thumb drive and in paper format to the Facilities & Land Management Committee at the February 17, 2010 meeting for review. On February 23, 2010, members of the Facilities and Land Management Committee met with UAA Community Campus Directors to hear from the Campus Directors their campus vision for short and longer term and how the Master Plans support institution and campus academic and strategic planning.

After the presentations and discussion with directors, the FLMC provided guidance at the April 2010 board meeting regarding finalizing the plans.

UAA feels the plans currently meet basic Regents' Policy requirements and will provide useful tools to the Community Campuses. These plans will be further refined in the next update expected to begin within the next 5 years.

Affirmation

All of the plans address the 12 elements required in Regents' Policy.

Action Requested

The 2010 UAA Community Campus Master Plans are submitted for adoption by the Board of Regents at this meeting. The Table of Contents and Executive Summary are included with the reference for this item. The full documents are available on the UAA website: <http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/masterplan/index.cfm>; and on a thumb drive provided. A limited number of paper copies will be available at the June 2010 meeting.

IV. New Business

A. Schematic Design Approval – Critical Electric Upgrade Phase 1B

Reference 14

The President recommends that:

MOTION

“The Facilities and Land Management Committee approves the Schematic Design Approval request for the University of Alaska Fairbanks Critical Electrical Distribution Renewal Phase 1B as presented in compliance with the campus master plan, and authorizes the University administration to complete construction bid documents, and to bid and award a contract within the approved budget, and to proceed to completion of project construction not to exceed a Total Project Cost of \$10,000,000 This motion is effective June 3, 2010.”

POLICY CITATION

In accordance with Regents' Policy 05.12.043, Schematic Design Approval (SDA) represents approval of the location of the facility, its relationship to other facilities, the functional relationship of interior areas, the basic design including construction materials, mechanical, electrical, technology infrastructure, and telecommunications systems, and any other changes to the project since Formal Project Approval.

Provided, however, if a Material Change in the project is subsequently identified, such change will be subject to the approval process described below:

- **TPC > \$4 million will require approval by the Board based on recommendations from the Facilities and Land Management Committee (F&LMC).**
- TPC > \$2 million but \leq \$4 million will require approval by the F&LMC.
- TPC > \$1 million but \leq \$2 million will require approval by the Chairperson of the F&LMC.
- TPC \leq \$1 million will require approval by the university's Chief Finance Officer (CFO) or designee.

RATIONALE AND RECOMMENDATION

Background

Five major deficiencies of the UAF electrical distribution system were identified in a report prepared by PDC Inc. Engineers in 2001. The report was commissioned in response to the near catastrophic power plant failure experienced in December 1998. The five deficiencies are:

1. The capacity of the connection to GVEA is undersized.
2. The UAF power plant switchboard short circuit rating is too small.
3. The location and configuration of the UAF power plant switchboard is not appropriate and represents a major risk factor for the reliability of electricity and steam.
4. The UAF electrical distribution system lacks redundancy that is typical for electrical utilities.
5. Congestion in the utilidor is making expansion of the electrical distribution system extremely difficult.

In order to address all of these problems, the report recommends that UAF move the campus distribution function out of the power plant and onto a new switchboard that is separate, but near the power plant. It was also recommended to increase the distribution voltage from 4,160v to 12,470v. The recommended changes would create increased reliability and capacity of the electrical distribution system.

Deficiencies 1 and 2 were partially remediated with the completion of the new connection to GVEA (Project No. 2004029 UTED) in September, 2005. This project constructed a new substation for the connection to GVEA. The new transformer in the substation is currently operating at 4,160v but can easily be reconfigured to operate at the proposed higher voltage of 12,470v. The new substation solves the short circuit rating deficiency (Item No. 2). The new substation has the capacity to allow UAF to purchase enough power from GVEA to supply current and future loads in the event of a UAF power plant failure, but circuit breaker

constraints in the UAF switchboard continue to limit the amount of power that could be purchased from GVEA to levels under our current peak loads. The completion of the project was an important first step in renewal of the UAF electrical distribution system; however, if UAF were to experience a power plant failure, it would not be able to purchase 100% of its power from GVEA. This represents a serious risk to UAF.

To implement the PDC recommendations, the remainder of the work can be done in three (3) phases. Phase 1 is the construction of the switchboard, associated utilidors and conversion of one feeder to 12,470v. This would completely remediate Deficiencies No. 1 and 3 and partially remediate Deficiencies No. 4 and 5. Phases 2 and 3 are the progressive conversion of all of the distribution feeders to 12,470v, and they would completely remediate Deficiencies No. 4 and 5. The completion of all three phases of the project will provide UAF with an electrical distribution system that is more reliable, compliant with current electrical codes and utility standards, and is sized to accommodate future growth.

Although the project was originally planned for three phases, the allocation of FY09 capital appropriations requires that Phase 1 be split into multiple projects (at least 3 phases). When Phase 1 is complete there will be a functioning electrical system for at least one feeder.

Phase 1A was completed in November 2009. The scope for this phase consisted of constructing 660 lineal feet of 8 ft. x8 ft. concrete utilidor and two large vaults for cable splicing. The utilidors will provide the ability to connect the existing electrical feeders to the new switchgear building that will be constructed in Phase 1B. The Phase 1A project scope also includes an overall concept design of all phases of the project (1, 2, 3) and complete construction documents for Phase 1 (all phases). The complete design was included in the Phase 1A scope to allow an efficient flow of construction work as additional funding for the subsequent phases was obtained.

The Phase 1A project is approximately \$600,000 under budget after substantial completion. UAF is planning to use these funds under the existing Phase 1A authority to extend the utilidor construction and prepare the site for Phase 1B construction. The CM@R contractor (Kiewit Building Group, Inc.) was selected for all phases of the Critical Electrical Distribution Renewal in the original solicitation. This was done to be able to efficiently and cost effectively add each subsequent phase of work as funding becomes available. This early start work will allow the seasonal Phase 1B work to be complete by November 2010 if the FY11 funding is available in July 2010.

Project Scope

The Phase 1B scope consists of constructing a new building that will house electrical switchgear that will be installed in a subsequent phase. The new building is separate from the existing Atkinson Power Plant but located in close proximity to the plant and its associated utilidor. The primary elements of the project are:

- A 50 ft. x110 ft. building with basement to house switchgear
- 150 lineal feet of utilidor to connect to Phase 1A utilidor
- 550 lineal feet of ductbank to connect new building to GVEA substation

The building will be located on the same site as the proposed Energy Technology Center (ETC), and its location is coordinated with the ETC. The switchgear building will border a service courtyard where other outbuildings associated with the ETC are located. This will allow a common access for both projects. The exterior appearance of the switchgear building will be compatible with the exterior finishes proposed for the ETC and its associated outbuildings.

The next phase of the project will install all the major electrical equipment including switchgear, transformers, switches, and cable, so at least one electrical feeder can be energized. Additional feeders will be energized if funds are available.

The drawings show the site layout and general arrangement and details for the new building.

Variance Report

The project scope that was presented in the Formal Project Approval included a fully functional facility that would energize at least one electrical feeder. The most recent cost estimate indicates that the scope that is within the budget for this phase will not result in a fully functional facility. The Critical Electrical Distribution Renewal project has always been planned as a multi-phase project that needs annual increments of funding over at least 4 phases before the entire campus electrical system has been upgraded. The original budget for this phase was \$10.0M and the current estimate is \$17M.

The reasons for the large discrepancy are:

- Electrical equipment and material costs have escalated significantly in recent years. The Handy-Whitman Index (a specialized electrical cost index) showed a 67% electrical cost

increase from 2004-2008. This rate of escalation outpaced the escalation rates applied to the 2001 estimate which was used for developing funding requests.

- Critical scope Items from Phase 2 were moved into Phase 1 to provide a functional facility at the completion of Phase 1, including energizing two feeder circuits.
- Additional scope items including:
 1. 400 feet of additional utilidor required for Phase 2 to connect the east utilidor and its associated electrical feeders to the new switchgear building. It is included in Phase 1 as a more cost effective means to construct all underground work in one phase.
 2. 40% larger building was required as the switchgear is larger than provided for in the original concept.
 3. New access road to accommodate fire apparatus was required by the Fire Marshall
 4. New technology switchgear that increases worker safety (arcflash resistant)
 5. Transformers that are 30% more in cost due to outcomes of a more detailed analysis of ground fault conditions.
 6. More complex connection to GVEA substation because substation was constructed in 2005 and temporary reactors and transfer switches were installed to maintain ground fault currents in an acceptable range and to provide additional reliability to UAF in lieu of constructing the entire project scope.

The overall estimate for the project (all phases; 1 through 3) has increased from \$31M to \$38M. Additional planning will be done prior to the submission of the next capital funding request to update the costs associated with subsequent phases. Approximately \$7M is needed to purchase electrical equipment, transformers, switches and cable to energize at least one electrical feeder.

Proposed Cost and Funding Source(s)

The proposed funding for this phase is the anticipated FY11 capital appropriation. The proposed budget and cost estimate is included as an attachment.

Estimated Maintenance and Operating Costs (O&M)

Utilities	\$60,000
Trash/Grounds	<u>\$ 5,000</u>
Total	\$65,000
 R&R (1.5% of facility value/yr):	 \$45,000

Consultant

PDC Inc. Engineers was selected as the design consultant for the project in Phase 1A in accordance with University regulations and procedures. The solicitation included the design scope for the entire project (Phases 1, 2, 3).

Other Cost Considerations

None

Backfill Plan

N/A

Schedule for Completion

DESIGN

Programming and Preliminary Design December 2009

Formal Project Approval February 2010

35% Schematic Design April 2010

Schematic Design Approval June 2010

Receive anticipated funding July 2010

100% Bid Documents July 2010

BID & AWARD

Request for GMP, bid subcontracts May 2010

Award Contract July 2010

CONSTRUCTION

Construction Starts July 2010

Substantial Completion October 2011

Beneficial Occupancy October 2011

Procurement Method for Construction

In Phase 1A the procurement method for all phases was determined. Construction Manager at Risk (CM@R) was selected to allow smooth transition between phases where funding would come to the project in increments. The smooth transition also provides cost savings to the University as mobilization, demobilization and the inherent inefficiencies of phased construction are mitigated by having a single contractor. The solicitation for the CM@R contractor was clear that the entire scope of work of the contract could include 3 phases of work, but funding was only available for a portion of the first phase. Kiewit Building Group, Inc. was selected as the CM@R for this project in accordance with Board Policy and Regulations. Under the terms of the original solicitation, the university can award contracts for phases subsequent to Phase 1A at their sole discretion.

Affirmation

This project complies with Regents' Policy, the campus master plan, and the planning approval.

Action Requested

Approval to complete the project construction documents, bid and award project in accordance with Total Project budget.

Supporting Documents

- One Page Budget
- Drawings
- Phase 1B 65% Design Cost Estimate

B. Schematic Design Approval – UAF Arctic Health Research Greenhouse

Reference 15

The President recommends that:

MOTION

“The Facilities and Land Management Committee approves the Schematic Design Approval request for the University of Alaska Fairbanks Arctic Health Research Greenhouse as presented in compliance with the campus master plan, and authorizes the university administration to complete construction bid documents to bid and award a contract within the approved budget, and to proceed to completion of project construction not to exceed a Total Project Cost of \$5,325,000. This motion is effective June 3, 2010.”

POLICY CITATION

In accordance with Regents' Policy 05.12.043, Schematic Design Approval (SDA) represents approval of the location of the facility, its relationship to other facilities, the functional relationship of interior areas, the basic design including construction materials, mechanical, electrical, technology infrastructure, and telecommunications systems, and any other changes to the project since Formal Project Approval.

Unless otherwise designated by the approval authority or a Material Change in the project is subsequently identified, SDA also represents approval of the proposed cost of the next phase(s) of the project and authorization to complete the Construction Documents process, to bid and award a contract within the approved budget, and to proceed to completion of project construction.

For the Schematic Design Approval, if there has been no Material Change in the project since the Formal Project Approval, approval levels shall be as follows:

- TPC > \$4 million will require approval by the Facilities and Land Management Committee (F&LMC).
- TPC > \$2 million but ≤ \$4 million will require approval by the Chairperson of the F&LMC.
- TPC ≤ \$2 million will require approval by the university's Chief Finance Officer (CFO) or designee.

RATIONALE AND RECOMMENDATION

Relocating the West Ridge Greenhouse this season and continuing design using a small portion of UA's \$20.6 million funding commitment for the Life Sciences Project provides the Board of Regents a mechanism to keep its highest new construction priority on schedule and within proposed budget. The two Board actions required are this Schematic design approval and the Finance Committee agenda item, Debt Approval for University of Alaska Fairbanks Life Sciences Project Continued Design and Site Preparation including Greenhouse Relocation. This decision carries some risk, but at a level that is seen as prudent to preserve the value of the funding from a minimum one-year delayed construction schedule.

As background, in February 2010 the Board provided Formal Project Approval. The project in that approval was described with three component parts: the required site preparation (including the replacement greenhouse), the steam line expansion, and the actual Life Sciences Facility. In the FY11 State of Alaska (SOA) Capital Budget, the legislature approved a G.O. bond bill that, if approved by voters in November 2010, will provide \$88.0 million in state funding for the Life Sciences Classroom and Laboratory Project (including related facility relocation and infrastructure cost). In the same capital appropriations bill, the SOA approved \$20.6 million non-general fund (NGF) revenue bond authority.

Unfortunately, the legislature did not provide the \$25 million project start-up funding via FY11 general funds to fund schematic design, site preparation with the greenhouse relocation, and the necessary steam expansion. These funds were needed to ensure G.O. Bond funding and UA's NGF portion could be put toward bricks and mortar as early as April 2011. At a minimum, initial site work including construction of the replacement greenhouse and continuing to schematic design of the Life Sciences Facility must occur this season to allow breaking ground on the main building in April 2011 and utilize the 2011 construction season.

Under this minimum approach, the required steam expansion will be delayed and sequenced in parallel with the Life Science Facility construction. Delaying the steam expansion until Summer 2011 is logistically more difficult, but possible without delaying construction. However, if UAF does not prepare the facility site this season, the Life Sciences Facility will be delayed a minimum of one year (break ground April 2012). The facility cost escalation resulting from a one-year delay is estimated at \$5 million. This is based on the construction estimator's assessment of Alaska's construction environment as well as national and international factors that will affect the cost of materials.

To avoid this costly delay, administration is requesting Schematic Design Approval for the greenhouse and proposes to utilize a portion of the UA funding commitment, \$20.6 million non-general fund revenue bond authority, to advance the initial site work including the greenhouse replacement, \$5,325,000, and complete the schematic design portion of Life Sciences Facility, \$1,675,000. Also, planning completed since the Formal Project Approval in February 2010 is \$1,000,000 and would be rolled into the final financing mechanism, thus bringing the total not to exceed \$8,000,000.

Although there is fiscal risk associated with this action, the institutional risk is minimized by the following factors:

- Under a best case scenario working capital could be utilized through December 2010 and no debt issuance would be necessary until the full project is financed.
- UAF has a business plan in place for accommodating the full \$1,650,000 anticipated debt service required on the \$20.6 million. This advance obligation is just over a third of that amount.
- Under a worst-case scenario, an improved research greenhouse would exist and UAF user departments are willing to reallocate funding to meet the debt service requirement. Additionally, fund raising and existing endowment proceeds could offset any shortfall.

The four scenarios below provide a range of possible outcomes of approving the greenhouse schematic design and the corresponding advance funding financing plan. The risk and return of each need the board's consideration:

1. Best Case Scenario: The G.O. bond passes and the entire project is completed on schedule at \$108.6 million total project cost, \$88.0 million state revenue and \$20.6 million university NGF. In late June 2010, a short-term bank loan or internal working capital is

utilized to fund activity through December 2010 at which time such financing arrangement is rolled into the originally anticipated \$20.6 million NGF portion for which UAF will fund debt service through increased and redirected indirect cost recovery. Debt service would be minimal in FY12 (estimated \$300,000). At project completion in 2014, UA NGF debt service on the full \$20.6 million is estimated at \$1.65 million.

2. Moderate Case Scenario 1: The G.O. bond fails, UA Board of Regents continues to support the Life Sciences Facility as UA's top construction priority and the legislature provides general funds for Life Sciences construction in FY12. The entire project can be completed on schedule at \$108.6 million total project cost. A short-term bank loan or working capital is utilized to fund activity through July 2011 at which time such financing arrangement is rolled into the originally anticipated \$20.6 million NGF portion for which UAF will fund debt service through increased and/or redirected indirect cost recovery. Debt service would be minimal in FY12 (estimated \$600,000). At project completion in 2014, UA NGF debt service on the full \$20.6 million is estimated at \$1.65 million.
3. Moderate Case Scenario 2: The G.O. bond fails, UA Board of Regents continues to support the Life Sciences Facility as UA's top construction priority and the legislature provides partial general funds for Life Sciences construction in FY12. The project can continue on schedule through FY12. The administration assesses the best financing arrangement to fund activity through July 2011 at which time future UA NGF commitments will be analyzed relative to the amount of GF, project sequence, and Board approval. Debt service would be reasonable in FY12 (estimated \$600,000).
4. Worst Case Scenario: The G.O. bond fails and the legislature provides no general funds for construction in FY12. The university issues revenue bonds utilizing a portion of its \$20.6 million NGF revenue bond authority to refinance short-term borrowings incurred for the construction of the greenhouse and Life Sciences design. Debt service would be a reasonable amount beginning in FY12 (estimated \$600,000). Long-term debt service would be provided through redirected indirect cost recovery of user departments and the entire campus. Fund raising, endowment proceeds, and seeking state general fund relief are also options that can be considered if forced to the worst case.

Project Scope

The West Ridge Greenhouse serves a tri-partite mission: Research, teaching, and community service. The School of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences (SNRAS) utilizes the greenhouse to conduct research on food and plants that survive in harsh northern climates around the world. The research is then translated into information for the community of Alaska to promote sustainability, health, and welfare to the State's residents. Students at UAF also learn how these plants can be grown, harvested, and modified to serve a beneficial purpose.

As part of the new Life Sciences Facility Project, the West Ridge Greenhouse will be removed from the Life Sciences construction site. UAF proposes to construct a new, multi-level modern research greenhouse connected to the Arctic Health Research Building (AHRB). UAF recently completed a major renovation to the southwest wing of AHRB and prepared the space for connection to the new greenhouse.

UAF requires a maximum of 10,000 gross square feet (gsf) of greenhouse space. The new structure will be designed to meet the program goals of SNRAS and to meet all current building codes, safety regulations, and University Design Standards.

Site Planning and Development

The site south of AHRB is currently partially excavated, and it serves as a staging area for facility construction and repairs. Site planning will address vehicular and pedestrian circulation, storm drainage, snow removal, fire apparatus access, grading, signage, lighting, sidewalks, and landscaping.

The excavated area will be utilized as a basement for greenhouse rooms, mechanical, and storage space. Above the basement level, additional greenhouse space will be constructed and connected directly to an existing teaching lab and hallway in the southwest wing of AHRB.

General Facility Requirements

The building will be completely enclosed with greenhouse glazing (polycarbonate and glass), a complete built up roof assembly in utility spaces, rated and non-rated wall assemblies, windows, insulated hollow metal doors (with hardware), and louvers. The exterior envelope will have the maximum thermal performance available on the market for greenhouse. Pre-engineered structures may be acceptable.

The interior spaces will be built to create zones that can easily be modified for a specific type of plant research. This will provide the users with the greatest ability to adjust temperatures, humidity, and lighting as the

research changes. The project will provide adjustable work stations in the greenhouse that are ADA compliant.

The structure will be attached to the existing AHRB on the southwest wing. As such, the structural design will need to include special design necessary in the Fairbanks area for lateral loads due to seismic events and wind up-lift. The design will also need to accommodate changing soil loads as plants are moved in and out of the rooms. Since the project will be built against an existing space, the foundation will utilize one existing wall to support the weight above.

The mechanical and electrical systems for this facility will be designed in accordance with the University Design Standards, applicable building, and other industry standards.

The mechanical system will provide a minimum number of air changes per hour to maintain ambient interior temperature for each different greenhouse room. The system will be particularly robust for summer time cooling, and wintertime heating to overcome thermal variance through the greenhouse glazing. Special waste plumbing systems will be installed to handle the abundant amount of soil and water found in any greenhouse.

The electrical systems for the greenhouse will provide normal and standby power. Standby power is especially critical to keep the plants cool during the hot summer months and warm during the winter. Lighting will be provided for normal and emergency situations and will feature the most efficient systems that can be easily moved or changed as the research changes. Communications and data outlets will be provided where needed.

Variance Report

The supporting documents demonstrate the layout the users have generally agreed upon. Although the total space program varies from the program presented in the February 2010 Formal Project Approval, the amount of gross square footage is still the same. UAF has devised a plan to put working greenhouse space in a portion of the addition that was previously considered a basement. Additional minor changes are anticipated due to the nature of a Design-Build project, the schematic design is a guideline and the final design layout, elevations, and floor plans will be determined by the design-builder selected by the university within cost constraints.

Proposed Cost and Funding Source(s)

The proposed total project cost is \$5,325,000 funded from a UA Revenue Bond.

Estimated Maintenance and Operating Costs (O&M)

Based on projected rates for FY12 and for both the base bid and future alternate:

Utilities	\$119,000
(based on a higher rate for the low thermal performance)	
Custodial	\$ 24,300
Trash and Ground	\$ 5,200
M&R	\$ 79,900

Consultant(s)

The consulting firm, Bezek Durst Seiser, is completing the technical proposal documents for the Design Build Request for Proposal. A design-builder will provide a qualified architectural and engineering team that will complete the actual design of the facility.

Other Cost Considerations

None

Backfill Plan

The existing greenhouse will be demolished to make way for the Life Sciences Facility, thus, there is no backfill plan for the space being occupied currently by the user group.

Schedule for Completion

DESIGN

Conceptual Design	January 2010
Formal Project Approval	February, 2010
35% Schematic Design	May 2010
Schematic Design Approval	June 2010
65% Design Development	July 2010
Construction Documents	August 2010

BID & AWARD

Design-Build RFQ/RFP	June 2010
Design-Build Contract Award	July 2010

CONSTRUCTION

Start of Construction	August 2010
Date of Substantial Completion	April 2011
Date of Beneficial Occupancy	May 2011

Procurement Method for Construction

UAF plans to utilize a Design-Build method of procurement.

Affirmation

This project complies with Regents' Policy, the Campus Master Plan, the Project Agreement, and the Life Sciences Classroom and Laboratory Project Formal Project Approval granted in February, 2010 by the Board of Regents. The Life Science Formal Project Approval included three scopes of work; Life Sciences Facility, a replacement greenhouse, and steam heating expansion. UAF is seeking Schematic Design Approval for the entire scope of work related to the replacement greenhouse.

Action Requested

Approval by the F&LM Committee to complete the design-build RFP, complete project construction documents, and to bid and award the project in accordance with total project budget.

Supporting Documents

- One Page Budget
- Schematic Drawings

V. Ongoing Issues

- A. Report on Kenai Peninsula College Campus Housing Reference 16

INTRODUCTION

Housing need is an issue for several campuses. In part, it may be beneficial to evaluate housing demand and project needs for the UA system in conjunction with this project development.

RATIONALE AND RECOMMENDATION

This project, if approved by the voters, will provide a student housing complex at the KPC Kenai River Campus. The McDowell Group performed a student housing demand study for KPC in Spring 2008 that proves a very strong need and demand for such housing at the campus. This report is included in the reference tab for this agenda item. KPC offers degree and certificate programs that are not available anywhere else in Alaska, thus creating the potential to attract students to these high demand job degree programs. However, without on-campus housing, these students are unable to pursue their college goals in Alaska. KPC has a service area of 25,000 square miles with many students living outside commuting distance or off the road system. Rural students frequently prefer to go to college in a rural setting, according to the McDowell Group study. The study states, "...housing helps to ease the transition to college, and in the case of rural community colleges, student housing opens up the opportunity for prospective students who are not willing to leave rural Alaska to attend college."

Based upon the literature review included in the McDowell Group study, housing at KPC supports the UA Strategic Plan and should be considered a priority in order to increase the number of Alaskans attending UA and retain those that choose our university. Based upon the low success rates of rural students attending the urban MAU campuses, these students should be given the choice to attend rural campuses like KPC where they can receive personalized attention in smaller classes at “high touch” campuses.

Project Scope

This project would construct a 35,000 gsf facility providing space for 96 student beds and living space for three resident assistants. The 24 units will consist of 4-person apartments with shared kitchen, living room and two students each sharing a bathroom. The facility will have office space for the three resident assistants, a residence housing coordinator and an administrative assistant. Student amenities include two lounges, computer room, laundry room and mailroom.

The attached Commons area will provide a fitness room and seating for 100 where various student activities can be held. Dining service will not be available, but the Commons would include a serving area and commercial kitchen that could be used to support special events and summer conferences. KPC has a strong partnership with the neighboring Alaska Christian College (ACC) that has a dining hall for their resident students. The KPC director has had preliminary discussions with the ACC president that would enable KPC housing students to purchase meal plans from ACC, located just 500 yards from the KPC housing site.

Variance Report

None

Proposed Total Project Cost and Funding Source(s)

FY11 Capital Budget	\$1,800,000
FY11 GO Bond	<u>\$16,000,000</u>
Total Project Cost	\$17,800,000

Estimated Annual Maintenance and Operating Costs (O&M)

KPC Housing would be an auxiliary for operating purposes and would not require general funds for M&R and Operating cost, but would need general fund support for R&R requirements.

Year 1 - occupancy at 69%

Agenda
Facilities and Land Management Committee
 June 3, 2010
 Anchorage, Alaska

Labor	\$145,408
Utilities	\$65,088
Telecomm	\$30,978
Housing M&R	\$157,500
Housing R&R	TBD
Other	<u>\$ 20,000</u>
Total	\$424,151

Consultant(s)
 TBD

Other Cost Considerations
 None

Backfill Plan
 None

Schedule for Completion

DESIGN	
Conceptual Design	Complete
Formal Project Approval	July 2010
Schematic Design	October 2010
Schematic Design Approval	December 2010
Construction Documents	May 2011
BID & AWARD	
Advertise and Bid	June 2011
Construction Contract Award	July 2011
CONSTRUCTION	
Start of Construction	July 2011
Date of Beneficial Occupancy	August 2012

Procurement Method for Construction
 Design/Bid/Build

Affirmation
 This project complies with Regents' Policy, the draft campus master plan, and the project agreement.

Supporting Documents
 Proposed Budget
 Operating Plan

B. Report on Formal Project Approval for Community Campus Planning

This project has been approved by the Chair of the Facilities and Land Management Committee and is for the committee's information only.

POLICY CITATION

In accordance with Regents' Policy 05.12.042, Formal Project Approval (FPA) represents approval of the Project including the program justification and need, scope, the Total Project Cost (TPC), and funding plan for the project. It also represents authorization to complete the development of the project through the schematic design, targeting the approved scope and budget, unless otherwise designated by the approval authority.

The level of approval required shall be based upon TPC as follows:

- TPC > \$4 million will require approval by the Board based on recommendations from the Facilities and Land Management Committee (F&LMC).
- TPC > \$2 million but ≤ \$4 million will require approval by the F&LMC.
- **TPC > \$1 million but ≤ \$2 million will require approval by the Chairperson of the F&LMC.**
- TPC ≤ \$1 million will require approval by the university's Chief Finance Officer (CFO) or designee.

RATIONALE AND RECOMMENDATION

The legislature appropriated the \$1.4 million requested by the Board of Regents for community campus planning in the FY11 capital budget currently under review by the Governor's Office. Since the intent of these funds is to evaluate facility needs at each campus in the context of the UA Academic Master Plan it is desirable to begin this work as soon as the funds become available so that the information can be used in developing the FY13 capital plan. No work will commence until the governor acts on the state capital budget.

Vice President Julius and Associate Vice President Duke will work cooperatively with MAU and community campus leadership to develop the scope elements and the associated schedule for expenditure of these planning funds.

Project Scope

This Community Campus Study will enable the university to evaluate each community campus, using the UA Academic Master Plan as well as MAU strategic and campus master plans to identify space needs in support of

academic master plan priorities as well as support infrastructure needs, then test the ability of the current campus facilities to meet those needs. Any gap between need and existing facilities will be identified. Then as appropriate, projects will be developed and included in the University's Capital Improvement Plan. Given the high cost of construction, maintenance, utilities, and the changing demographics at many of these campuses, a more thorough analysis of the community campus facility needs is warranted.

In addition, consideration may also be given to performing advance design work for prioritized projects, participating in development of a system housing need statement and action plan for delivery, or other elements as identified in the scope development phase.

Variance Report

none

Proposed Total Project Cost and Funding Source(s)

FY11 Capital Budget appropriation

Estimated Annual Maintenance and Operating Costs (O&M)

Not applicable

Consultant(s)

Professional services will selected through issuance of an RFP.

Other Cost Considerations

N/A

Backfill Plan

Not applicable

Schedule for Completion (DRAFT)

Preliminary Scope Statement	September 2010
BOR Approval of Scope	December 2010
Draft report	April 2011
Final Report	June 2011

Procurement Method for Construction

Not applicable

Affirmation

This project complies with Regents' Policy.

C. Report on UAA Sports Facilities and Access Road Reference 17

Scope

Located near the corner of Elmore Road and Providence Drive the new UAA Sports Arena currently in design is approximately 150,000GSF. The current design will house a 3,200 seat performance gymnasium for basketball and volleyball; a practice and performance gym for the gymnastics program; support space consisting of a fitness and training room, administration and coaching offices, laundry facilities, A/V production, and locker and team rooms for basketball, volleyball, gymnastics, skiing, track and cross country programs. The project will include approximately 400 surface parking spaces. Through the use of existing UAA parking and a partnership with Providence Alaska Medical Center a total of 1300 parking spaces will be available for major spectator events. Site development includes parking, pedestrian, trail and road connections to provide adequate access for daily and event use. During evolution of design it became apparent that the UAA's Sports Arena facilities need supports a \$104 million, 5600 seat, 191K GSF facility.

Recent History

Preliminary planning began in 2006 and \$15 million in funding was appropriated in the FY09 Capital Budget. UAA selected a design team, McCool Carlson and Green with sports arena experts Hastings+Chivetta, to prepare the project design and a first phase of selective site work. Several workshops have been completed focusing on programming and on sustainability features that would reduce the operating cost of the facility. The amendment to the Master Plan and Formal Project approval was granted in February 2009. At the June 2009 board meeting design authority to 65% to include construction cost estimates and periodic updates was approved. The 35% design submittal was completed in early October 2009 and the design is currently approximately 50% complete.

At the December 2009 board meeting, a working group was established to review the campus's planning and programming to date. The working group wanted to know the right size for the arena; the total space requirement for Sports and Recreation including the arena, the renewal need for the WFSC, and other future needs; the estimated costs; and the potential funding sources. Between December 2009 and early March 2010 the working group met and was provided briefings, binders of background information, a summary of requirements, the costs associated with various requirements, and possible funding sources for the Arena. At a meeting on March 4, 2010, the working group received a briefing from the UAA staff demonstrating that our immediate requirement is for a \$104 million facility with 5600 seat performance arena, somewhat larger than

the arena currently in design. The briefing also included additional information relative to the scope and costs associated with the renewal of WFSC. The working group was satisfied that UAA had responded to their questions and indicated they would be turning the issue back to the F&LM Committee for direction.

UAA anticipates receiving acknowledgement from the F&LM Committee at the June 2010 board meeting to allowing design to continue for the required \$104M, 5,600 seat, 191K GSF facility. Funding would not exceed the \$8M approved for design at the June 2009 board meeting. UAA also requests approval to begin site/ road work within the site. The site/road work would be funded from the \$15M appropriated in FY09.

Proposed Cost and Funding Source(s) for phase one – Selected Site Development

FY09 \$15M for design and site work, GF

Graphic Description and Estimated Total Project Cost

See Attached Graphics for the Expanded Facility as provided to board working group in March 2010

FY11 State Budget includes a GO Bond which has \$60M in it for the Sports Arena. FY12 Capital Request: UAA will request the balance of funding for the Arena.

Proposed Schedule for Completion

Current Status of Design:	60% complete for the \$80M facility
Final Schematic Design:	TBD
Design Development:	TBD
Road Construction Documents complete:	July 2010
Construction Documents complete:	TBD
Road Bidding & Construction:	Late Summer 2010
Bidding & Construction	TBD
Occupancy:	2 yrs after start of arena construction

Affirmation

Preliminary Administrative Approval:	August 2008
Master Plan Amendment Approved:	February 2009
Formal Project Approval:	February 2009
Approval to Proceed thru 65% Design with Cost Estimate:	June 2009
Board Working Group established:	December 2009
UAA final presentation to BOR working group:	March 4, 2010

The project complies with Regents' Policy, applicable project agreements, pre-design statements and the campus master plan as amended.

Supporting Documents

--Revised Schematic as presented to the board working group in March 2010

--Preliminary Cost Estimate

D. IT Report to include IT Security Reference 18

CITO Smith will provide an update on security status with university systems and update the committee on current issues of information technology across the university including compliance with new federal regulations.

E. Construction in Progress Reference 19

Kit Duke, Chief Facilities Officer, and campus facilities representatives will update the committee regarding the ongoing investment in capital facilities and answer questions regarding the status report on active construction projects approved by the Board of Regents, implementation of recommendations by the external consultants, functional use survey, space utilization analysis, and other recent activity of note.

This is an information and discussion item; no action is required.

VI. Future Agenda Items

VII. Adjourn