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This is a report required by Board policy.
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               Assistant Vice President Suzanne Smith
               Athletics Director Norwood Teague

Purpose & Key Points

In accordance with Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority, review and approve amendments to the FY 2015 Capital Budget for the following project:

- Athletes Village – Twin Cities Campus

The Capital Budget Amendment requested at this time is for design services. A future request for approval to complete the project will be advanced upon an approved financing agreement.

The attached Project Data Sheet addresses the basis for request, project scope, cost estimate, funding, schedule and include a site map for this project.

Background Information

This project is planned to meet the current and future needs of the University's athletic programs. It will construct a new 340,000 square foot Athletes Village on the east side of the Bierman and Gibson-Nagurski buildings, on the University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus.

President’s Recommendation

The President recommends approval of an amendment to the FY2015 Capital Budget for the project listed below and of the appropriate administrative officers proceeding with the design for this project:

- Athletes Village – Twin Cities Campus
1. Basis for Request:

The Athletes Village program was initially outlined during an athletics facility needs assessment completed in 2013. The goal of the assessment was to understand how to provide student-athletes, administrators, and coaches with state of the art tools that allow everyone to share in the success of the Gopher athletic department. The study confirmed that facility deficiencies severely hamper possible success.

The proposed Athletes Village will meet current and future needs of the University’s athletics programs and will advance a unified athletic department. Most importantly, the proposed Center for Excellence creates space and an environment not currently available to our student-athletes. This space focuses on the academic, nutritional, and leadership needs and desires of all our student athletes and creates an environment that values all aspects of the student-athlete experience. The norm for NCAA Division 1-A programs is for more dedicated practice facilities. This project will result in that for Gopher athletics. The aging facilities at Gibson-Nagurski lack the necessary area for all sports that compete for practice space. Dedicated practice space results in consistent schedules and routine for athletes and coaches and allows everyone to maximize time for their sport and studies. This is also seen as an essential need as our coaches compete with other institutions during the recruiting process.

2. Scope of Project:

The project, located on the Twin Cities campus, will construct a new 340,000 sf Athletes Village on the east side of the Bierman and Gibson-Nagurski buildings. It is comprised of four buildings which include a Center for Excellence, Basketball Practice Facility, Indoor Football Practice Facility, and Football Performance Center.

The Center for Excellence (67,000 sf) will serve as a hub and flagship facility for the entire Athletics department and all 720+ student-athletes. This facility will include an Academic Center comprised of a computer lab, classroom, study hall, group study, and tutoring areas; a Leadership Center comprised of a multipurpose room, career and graduate resource room, academic counseling space, conference and interview rooms; a Training Table comprised of a kitchen, servery, and dining hall; and an athletics compliance suite.

The Basketball Practice Facility (67,000 sf) will provide separate facilities for both Men’s and Women’s basketball to train and practice. This will include separate courts, locker rooms, and coach and staff offices for both men’s and women’s basketball programs as well as a combined strength and conditioning area.

The Indoor Football Practice Facility (110,000 sf) will allow the University’s football program to match and exceed the facilities at other Big Ten schools. This will include a full field overrun with 90’ clear height and a partial field for lineman work.
The Football Performance Center (96,000 sf) will provide better support facilities for the football program. This will include locker rooms, players lounge, team meeting rooms, an equipment area and support space, dedicated strength and conditioning space, training, rehab and hydrotherapy rooms, support space, and coach and staff offices.

Though not in the scope of this project, the construction of these facilities will ultimately free up substantial space within the current Bierman/Gibson-Nagurski footprint for renovation and re-purposing for use by numerous men’s and women’s teams. The impact will further the University’s long-term commitment to excellence for each of the Gopher teams.

3. Master Plan or Precinct/District Plan:

The project is in compliance with the 2009 Twin Cities Campus Master Plan.

4. Environmental Issues:

Hazardous materials (contaminated soil and mercury) will be abated.

5. Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$125,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Construction Cost</td>
<td>$24,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Capital Funding:

Project funding is targeted to come from external fundraising supplemented by short term debt financing to the extent required to bridge timing differences between the actual receipt of donations and the construction timetable.

7. Capital Budget Approvals:

This project was not included in the FY2015 Capital Budget as fundraising was in progress. The Capital Budget Amendment requested at this time, in the amount of $15,000,000, is for design services.

A future request for approval to complete this project will be requested upon an approved financing agreement.

8. Annual Operating and Maintenance Cost and Source of Revenue:

The operating cost of the new facilities is anticipated to be approximately $8.10/sf.

9. Time Schedule:
Proposed Completion of Design  
Proposed Start of Construction (Site)  
Proposed Completion of Construction  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Completion of Design</td>
<td>May 2016*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Start of Construction (Site)</td>
<td>October 2015*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Completion of Construction</td>
<td>October 2017*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumes an approved financing agreement is in place prior to the June 2015 Board of Regents approval of the Annual Capital Budget

10. Project Team

Architect: BWBR Architects  
Construction Manager at Risk: TBD

11. Recommendation:

The above described project scope of work, cost, funding, and schedule is appropriate:

Norwood Teague, Director of Athletics  
Richard Pfutzenreuter, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer  
Pamela Wheelock, Vice President for University Services
Athletics Village
Twin Cities Campus
Site Location Map
Athletes Village
Twin Cities Campus
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Location Map – Athletes Village

Athletes Village

North
Project Rationale

• Existing facility deficiencies

• Limited options available for scheduling practices in existing venues

• Critical for recruitment

• Provides state-of-the-art tools to student-athletes, administrators, and coaches

• Create a hub for the entire Athletics Department and 720 student-athletes
Project Description

- 340,000 SF Athletes Village includes:
  - Center for Excellence
  - Basketball Practice Facility
  - Indoor Football Practice Facility
  - Football Performance Center

- Total Project Cost: $150,000,000
  - Construction Cost $125,350,000
  - Key assumptions
    - Buildings are included in a single phase
    - Construction is initiated in 2016
    - Financing agreements are complete and approved by CFO and President
Project Description - continued

- Capital Funding *
  - Private Gifts $15,000,000

Total Approved Project Budget $15,000,000
*for Schematic Design

- Architect:
  - BWBR Architects

- Project Delivery Method:
  - Construction Manager at Risk
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Agenda Item: Annual Update on Sustainability in Operations

☐ Review  ☐ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☒ Discussion

This is a report required by Board policy.

Presenters: Pamela Wheelock, Vice President, University Services
Jacqueline Johnson, Chancellor, Morris Campus
Shane Stennes, Sustainability Coordinator

Purpose & Key Points

Board of Regents Policy: Sustainability and Energy Efficiency states, “The University is committed to incorporating sustainability into its teaching, research, and outreach and the operations that support them.” The purpose of this presentation is to update the Board on operations sustainability activities and accomplishments, and to inform the Regents about proposed changes in sustainability governance and organizational structures for the institution.

Efforts that advance sustainability in the institution’s operations are widespread and at all scales – from individual actions, to initiatives covering a whole department or function, to system-wide programs that benefit multiple campuses and communities. This diversity provides a unique opportunity to model a variety of approaches and solutions to issues associated with the three aspects of sustainability: environmental, economic, and social justice.

Reflecting on the breadth of this activity across the University’s campuses, the following themes emerge:

- **Buildings** – How facilities are constructed and operated today significantly affects the sustainability of the institution, immediately and for decades to come given the longevity and durability of the built environment. Given this, the University is committed to applying sustainable building standards, which encourage choices for healthy indoor air, purchase of local materials, and features that reduce resource consumption and life cycle impacts for the building.

- **Energy** – The energy resources supporting teaching, research, and outreach are the primary contributor to the carbon footprint for most of our campuses and sites. Therefore, how we create the power that supports progress and discovery, and how much energy we consume, is a core component to operations sustainability efforts. Over the last year, progress continued on multi-year initiatives to use cleaner energy sources and to use energy more efficiently.
• Food – University research and instruction are deeply involved in the development of sustainable food systems. Students, faculty, and staff are taking these lessons learned from the classroom, the lab, and the field to transform and make more sustainable our campus food systems.

• Transportation – How we get to and around campus impacts a number of sustainability dimensions including carbon footprint, resource consumption, and personal wellness. Efforts to make our transportation systems more sustainable advanced during the last year with an increase in the availability and utilization of sustainable transportation such as mass transit and bicycle.

• Waste – What we do with products at the end of their useful life is an important strategy for resource conservation and sustainability. Diversion of waste to more sustainable disposal options was increased in the past year through expanding collection of organic waste and enhancing collection efforts during student move-in/move-out times.

These themes are aligned with the guiding principles and implementation objectives outlined in Board of Regents Policy: Sustainability and Energy Efficiency. The presentation will provide additional information to the Board on accomplishments and activities in the aforementioned areas.

**Sustainability Governance and Organization**

Over the course of the past year, sustainability at the University has reached an important reflection point. The Systemwide Sustainability Committee work team completed a project to examine and make recommendations for advancing sustainability at the institution. Simultaneously, the Twin Cities Sustainability Committee fulfilled two of its major objectives and it started development of a committee workplan for the future. Organizationally, the University's Sustainability Director and the Director of the Institute on the Environment both departed the institution for other opportunities.

The convergence of these activities and changes represent an important opportunity for the institution to reflect on what has been accomplished, to identify our future goals, and to determine how to organize to best advance institutional sustainability objectives. The presenters will review with the Regents changes to the sustainability committee structure.

**Background Information**

The University regularly publishes a report on its sustainability activities at [http://italladdsup.umn.edu/goals](http://italladdsup.umn.edu/goals)

February 2014: Annual Report on Sustainability, Energy Management, and Utilities to the Facilities and Operations Committee
Discussion Topics

• Importance of sustainability to University mission

• Future University sustainability interests
What is Sustainability?

- Social
- Economic
- Environmental
The University is committed to incorporating sustainability into its teaching, research, and outreach, and the operations that support them.

- Leadership
- Modeling
- Energy Efficiency
- Education and Outreach
- Research
- Operational Improvements

Morris’ Green Prairie Residence Hall
Institute on the Environment Formed
2006

Systemwide Sustainability, Goals, Outcomes, Measures Report
2009

Straight A’s on SEI Report Card
2011

Work Team Considers Future
2013

Regents Policy on Sustainability and Energy Efficiency Adopted
2004

Presidents’ Climate Commitment Signed
2008

Systemwide Sustainability Committee Appointed
2010

AASHE STARS Ratings: UMM Gold, UMTC Silver
2012

Second Nature Climate Leaders Award for Morris
2014
Sustainability Aligned with the Strategic Plan

• Address Grand Challenges
• Reciprocal Engagement
• Reject Complacency

Northrop Memorial Auditorium
Moving Forward

• What are our goals?
• How do we advance this work?
• What are achievable timeframes?
• How do we organize our efforts?
Envisioning Sustainability at the U

Understanding
- Shared Value: Build sustainability literacy and competency among faculty, students, and staff

Action
- Integrate into Culture and Practice: Infuse sustainability into day to day practices and programs.

Influence
- CHAMPION the UNIVERSITY’s LEADERSHIP & INFLUENCE as innovator and collaborator in pursuing Sustainability

Institutional Change
- Align the University’s Structure to LEAD the advancement of sustainability in education, research and outreach and operations that support them.
Future Structure Goals

- Build on our success
- Engage senior leaders
- Align accountability
- Increase capacity

Duluth’s Victus Farms
The University is committed to incorporating sustainability into its teaching, research, and outreach and the operations that support them.

- Leadership
- Modeling
- Energy Efficiency
- Education and Outreach
- Research
- Operational Improvements

Crookston’s Heritage Hall Rain Garden Under Construction
Energy

• Over $28 million in cost avoidance since 2008

• 60% of campus electricity is renewable at Morris

West Central Research and Outreach Center Solar Thermal Array
How does combined heat and power work?
Buildings

- Sustainable design in every project
- 7 Energy Star rated and 11 LEED certified buildings

LEED Silver Ianni Hall at Duluth
Waste

- 49% of waste diverted in 2014

- Crookston diverted ~ 500 lbs. of aluminum for the nonprofit Cans for Cancer
• 10 tons of food harvested systemwide

• 1,382 lbs. of food recovered and donated to Urban Ventures to feed families in need
Transportation

- Bike commuter program logged a million miles
- 13 electric vehicle charging stations on Twin Cities Campus

Light Rail on the Twin Cities Campus
Discussion Topics

• Importance of sustainability to University mission

• Future University sustainability interests
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Agenda Item: Long Range Planning: Balancing Stewardship, Focus, and Growth

☐ Review ☐ Review + Action ☐ Action ☒ Discussion

This is a report required by Board policy.

Presenters: Pamela Wheelock, Vice President, University Services
Michael Berthelsen, Associate Vice President, Facilities Management

Purpose & Key Points

University of Minnesota Twin Cities Campus Master Plan Guiding Principle #9 calls for optimizing the use of campus land and facilities and applying best practices. This principle further requires that:

• Campus facilities must be used efficiently and effectively in support of the academic mission.
• Assignment of space should encourage interdisciplinary use.
• Space needs are met first in ways other than building new facilities.
• Space is flexible and adaptable to ensure buildings can meet academic needs.

In recent years University Services has provided the Board of Regents with information on various aspects of the items addressed in this principle, including regular presentations on the Facilities Condition Assessment, space utilization, campus master planning, and the six-year capital planning process.

University Services has continued to evolve its thinking on these topics in response to changing programmatic needs, external forces, resource availability, and facility condition. The evolution of this thinking is a Physical Asset Strategy focused around individual buildings, collegiate facility portfolios, and institutional strategies. The presentation will introduce the concept of the multi-level Physical Asset Strategy and to focus on the first goal, A Plan for Every Building.

Historically, the University has approached each of its buildings as stand-alone asset that should be treated equally. With insufficient resources to adequately maintain the inventory, this approach has led to the current practice whereby 1) the University's limited repair and replacement and HEAPR funds are spread thinly across the campus in an attempt to keep ahead of the worst problems while 2) large amounts of capital are spent on a select few buildings to bring very obsolete facilities up to like-new condition (e.g., Tate Laboratory of Physics). This has led to a more reactionary renewal strategy and a slow decline in the condition of all but the select few facilities where the University is able to afford a whole building renovation.

The revised approach being put forth under “A Plan for Every Building“ will develop a more specific and intentional plan for each building with the goal of providing colleges with a better sense of the
type and timing of reinvestment that they can reasonably expect. These building-specific plans will allow for better coordination of future facility and programmatic investments. Accompanying this approach in a subsequent phase will be an increased emphasis on helping colleges and major administrative units think more holistically about their space portfolio, changing programmatic demands, and overall facility utilization.

Background Information

The 2009 Twin Cities Master Plan identified expansion at the edges of the East Bank campus. Since the plan’s adoption, growth has been achieved in one of the primary mission activities (research) by the development of parcels in identified areas. The Biomedical Discovery District added two major research buildings and additions: Cancer Cardio and an expansion to the Center for Magnetic Resonance Research. The University of Minnesota Health clinics are under construction and will function as a new entry to the east side of the East Bank of the Twin Cities campus. The Board of Regents recently approved the purchase of the block adjacent to the clinics, Block 31. Foundation-managed land at the intersection of Washington and Huron Boulevard offers the potential for coordinated planning in support of the evolution of the campus.

Since 2000, the University has fully renewed 11 buildings, removed 23 buildings from its inventory, constructed 15 new facilities, and improved dozens of buildings in some significant way through the use of HEAPR funds. The 2009 Twin Cities Campus Utility Master Plan established a roadmap for improving electrical distribution infrastructure, increasing chilled water capacity, and upgrading steam generation capabilities. As the Facilities and Operations Committee heard in December 2014, the majority of initiatives in that plan have been completed and a new utility master plan is being contemplated.

Robert Bruininks Hall, completed in 2009, is an example of the consolidated effort between the academic and operational sides of the University working to understand pedagogical changes and improve teaching and learning. In support of clinical advancement, University of Minnesota Health clinics are under construction on the East Bank and a comprehensive academic health facility study is underway.

Efforts such as the Smart Labs program will support research by providing more cost-effective facilities. Smart Labs is an emerging design approach to laboratory facilities, which are often the most utility-intensive spaces at the University. Through design and controls, mechanical systems monitor air quality, adjust air exchanges, and control temperature through a dynamic system that responds to occupancy and demand. The potential reduction in energy use is 50 percent or more.

The Board has heard updates on components of the physical asset strategy as follows:

- The Facilities Condition Assessment has been discussed annually with the committee since 2003.
- The Board reviews and adopts a six-year capital plan and an annual capital budget each year.
- An annual report on utilities includes components of the University’s infrastructure needs and plans to address them.
- Presentations with a focus on maximizing the University’s physical assets were given throughout FY 2013-2014.
Long-Range Planning: Balancing Stewardship, Focus, and Growth
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February 12, 2015
• Optimize the University’s physical assets
  – physical asset leadership
  – functionality
  – operating and lifecycle costs
  – consistent campus experience

• Ensure a safe University
  – safe and secure places
  – culture of shared responsibility

• Provide a memorable student experience
  – student-centric place
  – meaningful connections
  – quality, affordable services
Building Community
1. Cultivate a genuine sense of community
2. Strengthen connections to adjacent communities

Creating a Model Campus
3. Create a cohesive, memorable system of public spaces
4. Provide a compatible and distinctive built environment
5. Steward historic buildings and landscapes
6. Foster a safe, secure, and accessible campus environment

Integrating Local and Regional Systems
7. Preserve and enhance natural systems and features
8. Integrate transportation systems emphasizing pedestrians, bicycles, and transit

Using Resources Wisely
9. Optimize the use of campus land and facilities and apply best practices
10. Make the campus environmentally and operationally sustainable
11. Utilize the campus as a living laboratory to advance the University’s mission
Principle #9

• Campus facilities must be used efficiently and effectively in support of the academic mission
• Assignment of space should encourage interdisciplinary use
• Space needs are met first in ways other than building new facilities
• Space is flexible and adaptable to ensure buildings can meet academic needs
Space Goals

- **Aligned:** The University should provide the correct type, quality, and quantity of space required for people and programs to function effectively.

- **Sustainable:** The University should have only as much space as it can afford to operate, maintain, and support.

- **Managed:** The University should provide tools and incentives for maximizing the efficiency and effectiveness of its space resources.
2009 Anticipated Growth
Physical Asset Strategy

**Building**
- A plan for every building

**RRC**
- Portfolio-based facility investment and renewal plans

**Institution**
- Capital Strategy
  - Net New
  - Replacement / Renewal
  - Leasing
  - Utilization
  - Demolition

**Capital**

**Operating**
- Defined building-level facilities contacts and processes
- Financial and programmatic plans to establish facility requirements and guide investments
- Strategic Planning
  - Vision
  - Program Plans
  - Financial Plans
A Plan for Every Building

- Stewardship
  - which buildings are we going to invest in?
- Focus
  - which buildings will no longer be a priority?
- Growth
  - which areas of the campus are targeted for expansion or greater density?
## Campus Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Total GSF ¹</th>
<th>Estimated Replacement Value ²</th>
<th>Projected 10-Year Needs</th>
<th>10 Year Needs/Replacement Value = (FCNI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twin Cities</td>
<td>22,787,527</td>
<td>$8,639,540,998</td>
<td>$ 2,837,671,283</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth</td>
<td>3,233,888</td>
<td>$968,930,667</td>
<td>$ 262,611,844</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>993,166</td>
<td>$359,732,192</td>
<td>$ 131,879,334</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookston</td>
<td>674,626</td>
<td>$270,777,555</td>
<td>$ 56,161,631</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCs</td>
<td>1,576,493</td>
<td>$240,513,943</td>
<td>$ 53,533,685</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>29,265,700</td>
<td>$10,479,495,355</td>
<td>$ 3,341,857,777</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Total Gross Square Feet (formally assessed square feet approximately 80% of total). Excludes Rochester Campus. Does not include parking ramp decks.

² Limited portions of facility replacement value modeled pending completion of formal assessment and report.
## Building by Building Renewal Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Range</th>
<th>Condition (FCNI)</th>
<th>Renovation Cost ($ per GSF)</th>
<th>Operations &amp; Maint. Costs</th>
<th>Energy Demand (kBTU)</th>
<th>Space Efficiency</th>
<th>Historical Value (NHRP Status)</th>
<th>Code/Access (Issue Extent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low / Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>&lt;$25</td>
<td>&lt;95%</td>
<td>&lt;95%</td>
<td>Best</td>
<td>Listed or Eligible</td>
<td>4-Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>$25-$74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>$75-$124</td>
<td>95% to 110%</td>
<td>95% to 110%</td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>Steward</td>
<td>2-Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>$125-$199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High / Poor</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>&gt;$200</td>
<td>&gt;110%</td>
<td>&gt;110%</td>
<td>Worst</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0-Serious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STAGE 1
- **Adaptability**
- **Master Plan Fit**
- **Image/Aesthetics**
- **Usability**
- **Program Impact**
- **Displacement**

### STAGE 2
- **Catch-up / Keep-up**
- **Sustain**
- **Dispose or Replace**

49 of 61
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RRC / Renewal Category</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>% of Bldg</th>
<th>% of RRC</th>
<th>FCNI</th>
<th>10 Year Needs</th>
<th>Min_Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG EXPERIMENT STATION</td>
<td><strong>1_Keep Up</strong> AG AND LANDSCAPE STORAGE</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>$21,550</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1_Keep Up</strong> ANIMAL WASTE TREATMENT CENTER</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>$463,163</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1_Keep Up</strong> PLANT GROWTH FACILITIES - EAST</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>$2,510,802</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2_Catch Up / Keep Up</strong> AGRONOMY AND PLANT GENETICS GREENHOUSE</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>$2,260,334</td>
<td>$150,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2_Catch Up / Keep Up</strong> PLANT GROWTH FACILITIES - WEST</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,548,803</td>
<td>$260,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3_Sustain</strong> AGRICULTURAL CHEMICAL STORAGE BUILDING</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>$724,639</td>
<td>$114,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3_Sustain</strong> FARM AND GROUNDS MAINTENANCE BUILDING</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>$2,039,489</td>
<td>$347,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHC SHARED UNITS</td>
<td><strong>1_Keep Up</strong> CANCER CARDIOVASCULAR RESEARCH BLDG</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1_Keep Up</strong> DWAN VARIETY CLUB CARDIO RESEARCH</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>$17,053,667</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1_Keep Up</strong> MINNESOTA MOLECULAR AND CELLULAR THERAPY</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>$6,191,810</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1_Keep Up</strong> VETERINARY ANIMAL FACILITY</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>$618,778</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1_Keep Up</strong> 717 DELAWARE BUILDING [EST]</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>$6,606,298</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3_Sustain</strong> ANIMAL SHELTER [NO SURVEY]</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3_Sustain</strong> LARGE ANIMAL HOLDING</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>$2,282,301</td>
<td>$537,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4_Dispose</strong> VETERINARY ISOLATION BUILDINGS</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>$1,283,721</td>
<td>$433,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES, COL OF</td>
<td><strong>1_Keep Up</strong> ECOLOGY BUILDING</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>$9,581,976</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1_Keep Up</strong> CARGILL BLDG-MICROBIAL &amp; PLANT GENO</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>$2,378,554</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2_Catch Up / Keep Up</strong> BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>$51,908,099</td>
<td>$9,138,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2_Catch Up / Keep Up</strong> GORTNER LABORATORY</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>$24,204,626</td>
<td>$7,321,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2_Catch Up / Keep Up</strong> SNYDER HALL</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>$11,544,960</td>
<td>$2,633,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4_Dispose</strong> BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE GREENHOUSE</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>$2,444,699</td>
<td>$358,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLSON SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT</td>
<td><strong>1_Keep Up</strong> CARLSON SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>$8,619,584</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1_Keep Up</strong> HANSON HALL, HERBERT M., JR.</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$112,869</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facility Renewal Initiatives

1. Building by Building Planning
   - Develop a renewal plan for each building
   - Align financial resources to renewal plan

2. Facility Improvement Strategy
   - Shift renewal funding to more predictable source

3. HEAPR / R&R Planning
   - Expand consultative process with Collegiate units

4. Six Year Plan
   - Continue to refine current plan and priorities
Physical Asset Strategy

**Capital**
- Building
  - A plan for every building

**Operating**
- Defined building-level facilities contacts and processes
- Financial and programmatic plans to establish facility requirements and guide investments
- Strategic Planning
  - Vision
  - Program Plans
  - Financial Plans

**Institution**
- RRC
  - Portfolio-based facility investment and renewal plans
- Capital Strategy
  - Net New
  - Replacement / Renewal
  - Leasing
  - Utilization
  - Demolition
Discussion
Stewardship, Focus, and Growth
Facilities & Operations

Agenda Item: Information Items

☐ Review ☐ Review + Action ☐ Action ☐ Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

Presenters: Pamela Wheelock, Vice President, University Services

Purpose & Key Points

To update the committee regarding the following information items:

A. Update on TCF Bank Stadium Facility Use Agreement
B. Update on Combined Heat and Power Plant Permitting

Background Information

Information items are intended to provide the Board of Regents with information needed to perform their oversight responsibilities.
Update on TCF Bank Stadium Facility Use Agreement
University of Minnesota
February 2015

All of the planning that went into hosting the Minnesota Vikings at TCF Bank Stadium paid off with a smooth and successful first season. Vikings events followed the game day operations plan established and refined over the first five years of Gopher game day operations.

The most significant challenge for the season was the single weekend with back-to-back Gopher-Vikings games. Issues with workload, storage for two games worth of supplies, equipment, food and beverage, as well as general event coordination were raised by multiple operating units as something to be avoided in the future if possible.

Noteworthy items from the first season include:

- Construction - The University and Minnesota Vikings worked collaboratively to complete all required and requested improvements to TCF Bank Stadium within the agreed upon schedule and under the agreed upon budget. This included installation of the hydronic field heating system and new artificial turf, erection and removal of temporary bleacher seating (that will be reinstalled prior to the 2015 season), loge box heating, storage space, and the winterization of restrooms and elevator lobbies as warranted.

- Parking and Transportation – The parking and transportation plan followed that for Gopher events. Staff did note that it took longer to clear the streets after Vikings games than Gopher games. This was attributed to higher attendance, more conflicts at LRT intersections, and a different transportation mode split for the two events. On average the University parked about 7,700 cars per Vikings game, with about 2,500 having pre-purchased season parking passes. Parking averaged about 6,700 cars on the east bank and 1,000 cars in St. Paul. The METRO Green Line was incredibly popular causing long lines and delays. It was estimated that about 11,250 people arrived via the METRO per game. There was an average of 27 charter buses per game. There were no significant tailgating issues. Parking and Transportation will continue to work with the City of Minneapolis on improving the operation of the Huron Boulevard intersection as well as an emerging issue at Malcom Avenue SE where Surly brewery traffic crosses the University Transitway. Managing the numerous passenger transportation services, including taxis, limousines, Uber, Lyft, and charter shuttle buses remains an on-going challenge.

- Safety and Security – There were no significant safety or security issues during the season. On a per game basis, police calls were comparable to past Gopher seasons. University Emergency Medical Services had approximately 100 patient contacts throughout the season and arranged transport to local hospitals in 20 cases. Entry into the stadium was slowed due to NFL security policies and later arriving crowds. The Washington game and the associated protest more than
doubled the workload for public safety personnel for that one day and placed a significant burden on staff leading up to and planning for the event. In the end about 4,000 persons were able to peacefully protest with minimal disruption to the game.

• Stadium Operations - Facilities-related service calls during Vikings events were comparable to Gopher events with approximately 20 calls per game. Issues were relatively minor and included the usual items such as flooded toilets, broken cup holders, icy concrete, blown circuit breakers, and television channel and volume problems. Painting the end zone letters purple for the Vikings and back to gold for the Gophers was a challenge later in the season due to weather, but otherwise stadium conversion went well. Vikings games (both inside the stadium and tailgating) generated a total of 394,000 pounds of trash, of which 79% was recycled. Vikings games generated about 15 percent more trash per capita than Gopher games, but had a higher recycling recovery rate. At two games, the University achieved recycling recovery rates of 90% and 89%, exceeding the 85% peak of Gopher games. Vikings games as a whole generated about 50% more trash inside the stadium, and 50% less trash outside in the tailgate lots, than Gopher games.

• Community and Neighborhood – There were no significant or enduring game day issues in the community. A couple of game day related noise complaints were received from the St. Anthony Park neighborhood in St. Paul. Likewise, the increase in noise from media helicopters and airplane flyovers over the stadium generated comments from the community. Additional steps were put in place to improve communication with the community. Early in the season there were some complaints about excess trash off-campus, but these were resolved through operational changes as the season progressed.

• Food and Beverage – Numerous additional points of sale for both food and beverage, including hawkers, were added for Vikings events. These were adjusted throughout the season in response to lessons learned. Continued refinements are expected at Gate A which saw disappointing sales and foot traffic. During pre-season there were long lines for ATM’s and, in general, the concession stands with credit card readers did better than cash only stands. Additional internet jacks and credit card readers were added to the majority of stands by the start of the regular season. The increased points of sale in concessions and portables were well received and assisted in increasing per capita revenues. UMPD conducted alcohol compliance checks at four Vikings games. Aramark passed 66 of 68 compliance checks, a 97% success rate. In both cases of failed checks, the employee was terminated immediately.

• Finance - The University developed a consolidated bill through University Services for all University managed services including game day operations, construction, and parking. The Vikings are current on all 26 invoices issued by the University for the expenses agreed to in the Facility Use Agreement.
This memo is intended to provide a brief update on the status of the Combined Heat and Power (CHP) project on the Twin Cities campus.

On January 27, 2015 the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) Citizens Board reviewed the CHP permit application and environmental assessment worksheet, and gave the MPCA Commissioner approval to issue the air permit. The Commissioner wrote on January 29, 2015 indicating that he had signed the documents necessary for the permit to be issued.

The approval of this permit enables Capital Planning and Project Management to move ahead with the commencement of construction. We anticipate the plant to be operational in December 2016. The Guaranteed Maximum Price negotiated with the construction manager at risk has been approved and it is within the amended budget approved by the Regents at their December 2014 meeting. We continue to evaluate whether the amended budget is sufficient to address the costs of electrical distribution, or if additional funds will need to be requested through the annual capital budget process (as indicated at the December 2014 meeting.)