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A Vocabulary for Measurement

Facilities Measurement, Benchmarking & Analysis

**Annual Stewardship**
The annual investment needed to ensure buildings will properly perform and reach their useful life “Keep-Up Costs”

**Asset Reinvestment**
The accumulation of repair and modernization needs and the definition of resource capacity to correct them “Catch-Up Costs”

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

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

**Asset Value Change**

**Operations Success**
Topics to Review

I. Discuss Facilities Benchmarks for FY19
   • “Dual” Identities
   • Pre-War Construction
   • 5 Year Anniversary of Original Facilities Assessment Study
     • What does the future hold for resources?
     • Getting to a True Cost of Ownership

II. Key Takeaways

III. What Tools are at our Disposal?
   • Who do we need to communicate to? What do we need to communicate?
     • What context/data points do we have so our message be heard?
       • COVID Discussion
## Saint Louis University Facilities Peer Institutions

**ROPA+ Analysis Space Totaling 6.5M GSF**

### Jesuit Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>Newton, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton University</td>
<td>Omaha, NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield University</td>
<td>Fairfield, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga University</td>
<td>Spokane, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University Maryland</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle University</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph's University</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>Evanston, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>Winston-Salem, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparative Considerations

Size, technical complexity, region, geographic location, and setting are all factors included in the selection of peer institutions.
Space Profile
Qualifying Metrics – Technical Complexity

Tech Rating: Jesuit Peers

Tech Rating: Research Peers

Tech Complexity Affects:
- Repair and Replacement Cost
- Energy Consumption
- Operational Demands

1. House
2. Academic building with no central cooling
3. Academic building with central cooling
4. Academic science facility
5. High-end science research or Hospital

*Arranged by Tech Rating
Comparing Program Space per Student Among Peer Groups

SLU has much more program space per student than Jesuit peers and is more comparable to research peers.

*Arrayed by density*
SLU’s Space Distribution More Similar to Research Peers

Jesuit peers have much more residential space but less academic/admin space

Space by Function: SLU
- Acad/Admin Space w/ Medical (%): 16%
- Residential Space (%): 24%
- Student Life Space (decimal): 6%
- Support Space (%): 53%

Space by Function: Research Peers
- Acad/Admin Space w/ Medical (%): 12%
- Residential Space (%): 26%
- Student Life Space (decimal): 9%
- Support Space (%): 54%

Space by Function: Jesuit Peers
- Acad/Admin Space w/ Medical (%): 18%
- Residential Space (%): 36%
- Student Life Space (decimal): 7%
- Support Space (%): 40%
Putting Your Campus Building Age in Context

SLU’s waves of construction features several peaks in the Pre-War vintage, totaling 30% of space.

- **Pre-War:** Built pre-1951
  - Durable construction
  - Older but lasts longer
  - 30% SLU % of Pre-War Space
  - 20% Database Avg. % of Pre-War Space

- **Post-War:** Built 1951 - 1975
  - Lower quality
  - Needs more repairs & renovation

- **Modern:** 1975 - 1990
  - Quick flash construction
  - Low quality components

- **Complex:** Built post-1991
  - Technically complex
  - Higher quality
  - More expensive to maintain or repair

% of GSF by Construction & Renovation Year

- **Sightlines Database- Construction Age**
- **SLU**

Graph showing the distribution of space by construction and renovation year, with peaks at different periods and notes on the quality and maintenance requirements of buildings from each period.
Pre-War Space by Function: 41 Buildings

Academic & Administrative space makes up high proportion of pre-war space

### Pre-War Space by Function

![Pre-War Space by Function chart]

### Space Functions by Construction Vintage

![Space Functions by Construction Vintage chart]
Building Renovations by Construction Vintages

Renovations have occurred mostly in post-war space

### Renovated Pre-War Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>GSF</th>
<th>SL Function</th>
<th>Renovation Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young Hall</td>
<td>35,055</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il Monastero Banquet Center</td>
<td>13,067</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beracha Hall</td>
<td>38,346</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searls Hall</td>
<td>25,650</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Global Citizenship</td>
<td>77,996</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa de Salud Expansion</td>
<td>4,148</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>194,262</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Has Age Changed Over Time?

High risk space has been reduced since 2004 while 10 to 25 space continues to grow.

Renovation Age Change Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Under 10</th>
<th>10 to 25</th>
<th>25 to 50</th>
<th>Over 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buildings Under 10
Little work. “Honeymoon” period.
Low Risk

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

Buildings 25 to 50
Major envelope and mechanical life cycles come due. Functional obsolescence prevalent.
Higher Risk

Buildings Over 50
Life cycles of major building components are past due. Failures are possible. Core modernization cycles are missed.
Highest risk

GORDIAN®
SLU Has More High Risk Space than Both Peer Groups

Both peer groups have around 50% of space in high risk while SLU has 60%.

FY19 Renovation Age Vs. Peers

- **Buildings Over 50**
  - Life cycles of major building components are past due. Failures are possible. Core modernization cycles are missed.
  - Highest risk

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

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

- **Buildings Under 10**
  - Little work. “Honeymoon” period.
  - Low Risk
Future Outlook of Age with No Renovations

Assuming no space changes, more of SLU’s campus will move into high risk

Renovation Age: Now Vs. Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY24</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY29</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buildings Entering Over 50 Category in Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Resources Center</td>
<td>107,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>81,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doisy Hall</td>
<td>73,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor’s Office Building</td>
<td>46,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegeler Hall*</td>
<td>36,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Annex</td>
<td>33,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boileau Hall</td>
<td>9,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>388,744</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tegeler Hall is only building that enters over 50 category in FY24
Capital Spending & Future Need
Total Capital Investment

Over time, SLU has spent more into new space than existing space and infrastructure combined.
Spending by Category: Impact of New Space Investment

When excluding new space spending, the breakout shows highest investment into space renewal.
SLU Spending Less than Peers on Average

SLU has less one time funds than research peers and more one-time funds than Jesuit peers, but both peers have more stewardship dollars.

*does not include infrastructure

**Fairfield removed from Jesuit peers for FY17-FY19
Defining an Annual Investment Target

Annual Funding Target: $37.1M

FY19 Annual Investment Target

- 3% Replacement Value: $69.4
- Life Cycle Need: $60.8
- Annual Investment Target: $37.1

Millions
Total Capital Investment vs. Funding Target

Sizable increase in overall capital investment, especially in Annual Stewardship funding

*does not include infrastructure
While needs have been addressed since 2015, inflation calculation increases overall total need.

Total Need Comparisons: 2015 Vs. 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Need (Millions)</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Need</td>
<td>$533</td>
<td>$509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Needs: 2015 Vs. 2019

Total Needs by Timeframe: 2015 Vs. 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2019 (Inflated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backlog</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Timeframe (1-3 Years)</td>
<td>$158</td>
<td>$192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Timeframe (4-7 Years)</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>$152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Timeframe (8-10 Years)</td>
<td>$158</td>
<td>$163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes building, grounds, and infra.
Highest Changes in Needs by Building

Over 50 buildings have the largest increase in needs, but also represent the buildings taken offline.

Buildings with Largest Increases in Need Since 2015

Buildings with Largest Decreases in Need Since 2015

*Accounts for inflation
Older Spaces Experiencing Higher Need

Pre-War buildings have more needs per GSF than any other vintage despite some being renovated

### Need ($/GSF) by Construction Vintage

**Pre-War**
- $122

**Post-War**
- $105

**Modern**
- $101

**Complex**
- $53

### Need ($/GSF) by Renovation Age Category

**Under 10**
- $17

**10 to 25**
- $73

**25 to 50**
- $102

**50+**
- $127
Defining Investment Criteria for SLU

Roughly 10% of SLU’s 10-year needs are classified as reliability needs that present high risk.

- **Reliability**: Issues of imminent failure of compromise to the system that may result in interruption to program or use of space.
- **Safety/Code**: Code compliance issues and institutional safety priorities or items that are not in conformance with current codes, even though the system is “grandfathered” and exempt from current code.
- **Asset Preservation**: Projects that preserve or enhance the integrity of buildings systems, structure, or campus infrastructure.
- **Economic Opportunity**: Projects that result in a reduction of annual operating costs or capital savings.
- **Program Improvement**: Projects that improve the functionality of space, primarily driven by academic, student life, and athletic programs or departments. These projects are also issues of campus image and impact.

Facilities Assessment - Identified Needs:

- Asset Preservation: 62%
- Economic Opportunity: 9%
- Program Improvement: 3%
- Reliability: 3%
- Safety/Code: 23%
Buildings with Highest Reliability Needs Present Risk

Marguerite and The Mansion have the highest reliability needs per GSF, risking displacement of students.

### Top 10 Highest Reliability Need Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Cost (GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marguerite Hall</td>
<td>$5,131,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mansion</td>
<td>$769,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh Hall</td>
<td>$2,514,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Mattias Hall</td>
<td>$4,748,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinert Hall</td>
<td>$4,705,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griesedieck Hall</td>
<td>$4,373,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>$2,679,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchetti Towers East</td>
<td>$2,997,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchetti Towers West</td>
<td>$2,925,197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spending to Target: 5 Year Projection

Targets will increase with the addition of the second half of the SLUCare Academic Pavilion and ISE Building

Total Capital Investment vs. Funding Target

- Increasing Net Asset Value
- Lowering Risk Profile
- Increasing Backlog & Risk

*does not include infrastructure
SLU’s AR Need Stabilizes, Driven by Recent Capital Investments

SLU is just under $100/GSF in AR Need, which indicates a campus is more reactive than proactive.

![Asset Reinvestment Need ($/GSF) vs. Peers](image)

- **SLU**: FY10-FY15: 27% increase, FY15-FY19: 10% increase
- **Jesuit Peers**: 
- **Research Peers**:
Operations Profile
New buildings will require annual operational and capital attention to keep up to the demand of the space

*dollars shown in present day value

Sightlines, LLC. All Rights Reserved.
Research Peers Feature More Resources On Average

Research institutions have almost $1/GSF more on average than Jesuit peers

*dollars shown in present day value
Resources Keeping Pace With Space Additions, Not Inflation

New buildings will require annual operational and capital attention to keep up to the demand of the space.

People Costs, Expenses Over Time ($/GSF)

- People Costs, Expenses
- Inflation

SLU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$/GSF</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reactive Work Orders by Construction Vintages

Pre-war buildings consuming the most time and resources of maintenance staff

Reactive Work Order Cost by Construction Vintage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Cost ($/GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-War</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-War</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reactive Work Order Hours by Construction Vintage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Hours/1000 GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-War</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-War</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arrayed youngest to oldest
Reactive Work Orders by Renovation Age

Factoring renovations into age, 25 to 50 aged buildings are consuming the most time & resources.
Comparing Maintenance Coverage Among Peer Groups

SLU’s maintenance coverage in line with peer institutions

Maintenance Coverage Ratio vs. Jesuit Peers (FY19)

Maintenance Coverage Ratio vs. Research Peers (FY19)

Arrayed by technical complexity
Maintenance Worker, Supervisor FTE Overview

Angela Hawkins’ departure brings supervisor FTE to 4.9 in FY20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Name</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Steen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wenkel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson Rasnic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismael Lopez</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Hawkins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt McCuen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Goedde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barth Breneman*</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith McCune*</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ty Dennison*</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matt McCuen moved into Project Manager, Construction Services role (FY19).

*One-third of AD’s time spent supervising
Comparing Maintenance Supervision Among Peer Groups

Replacing at least one additional supervisor will be important to stay in line with peers.

Maintenance Supervisor Ratio vs. Jesuit Peers (FY19)

Maintenance Supervisor Ratio vs. Research Peers (FY19)

Arrayed by technical complexity
Comparing Custodial Coverage to Research & Jesuit Peers

SLU similar to peer averages & database average in custodial coverage

Custodial Coverage Ratio vs. Jesuit Peers (FY19)

Custodial Coverage Ratio vs. Research Peers (FY19)

Arrayed by density
Key Takeaways
The oldest buildings on campus cost more, and there’s more of this space on SLU’s campus than Peers

SLU’s space profile is driven by its older Pre-War construction with almost 50% of campus over 50 years old. This percentage will continue to rise without major building renovations in the near future. Understanding that major renovations may be difficult to undertake, due to the types of buildings and financial constraints, strategic project selection becomes an even more important strategy.

**Key Takeaways**

**Waves of Construction: Pre-War Space**

- **Pre-War**
  - Built pre-1951
  - Durable construction
  - Older but lasts longer

**FY19 Renovation Age Vs. Peers**

- **SLU**
  - Under 10: 12%
  - 10 to 25: 27%
  - 25 to 50: 16%
  - Over 50: 21%

- **Jesuit Peer Average**
  - Under 10: 13%
  - 10 to 25: 22%
  - 25 to 50: 16%
  - Over 50: 23%

- **Research Peer Average**
  - Under 10: 12%
  - 10 to 25: 27%
  - 25 to 50: 22%
  - Over 50: 28%
The oldest buildings on campus cost more, and there’s more of this space on SLU’s campus than Peers

SLU’s space profile is driven by its older Pre-War construction with almost 50% of campus over 50 years old. This percentage will continue to rise without major building renovations in the near future. Understanding that major renovations may be difficult to undertake, due to the types of buildings and financial constraints, strategic project selection becomes an even more important strategy.
Significant increase in capital investment stabilizes deferred maintenance growth

In 2015, SLU and Sightlines worked together to build a 10 year outlook of the capital investment needs on campus. This project lead to a substantial increase in capital funding over the next 5 years, where the average annual investment into existing space increased from $9M per year to $27M per year. This influx of capital stunted a historical rise in Asset Reinvestment Need, especially in the last 2 years. Ensuring current funding capacities will be integral to the long-term health of the building systems on campus.

Key Takeaways
Key Takeaways

**Operating resources keeping pace with space additions, but not all campus changes**

Daily operating resources to address both reactive and planned maintenance has remained steady and consistent, even as the amount of space on campus ebbs and flows. Other issues, however, like inflation and staffing turnover, are external factors that force the facilities department to do more with less, and thus creates strain on the department and the campus as a whole.
Tools At Our Disposal To Communicate Facilities Needs
This report outlines major trends that are happening throughout the industry:

1. Growing facilities needs backlog
2. Compounding waves of lifecycle needs
3. Fewer students and less revenue

Another Resource:

The Chronicle is hosting webinars over Zoom. “What a College Should NOT Do During a Recession”

1. Refrain from any rash decision making
2. Utilize data whenever possible to influence decision making

https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_joy1IA21QzKSh_6cwQ-68A?mkt_tok=eyJpIjoiTmpVMlpqUTFZVEZpTUdVeisImQjOiUiK9hTVX0aDRkYdI3ZDeUROTWh6ZLwvR1VwaKV4VmlrWDZ4dGIRUhy5IvyVUYiGmjSgSwjFM6E2jMEzmWUl5TYz4WQqyrj0MjZ1LlFQVrFHVWNiOHiPdt422RUE5Iz5UNsWDU0YjBiaKVQVvRE RmNqWUjxZUNYm1Rin0%3D
How Can We Measure the True Cost of Ownership?

Sample Building

Total Cost of Ownership

Utility Cost
Cost and consumption of water, sewer, fossil, & electric

Custodial Cost
Cleaning costs associated to the specific building; tracking labor hours, materials

Maintenance Cost
Sum of all internal and contracted reactive and planned maintenance efforts; labor and materials

Annual Capital Need
Capital dollars needed on an annual basis to fund projects/renovations (10 year look - from project list)

Sample Data
Classifying Buildings into Portfolios

Saint Louis University $574.0M

Building Needs $552.9

- Admin & Other Support $39.2M
  - 13 Buildings 683k GSF

- Medical Affairs $101.0M
  - 13 Buildings 715k GSF

- Provost & Research $230.3M
  - 40 Buildings 2.54M GSF

- Student Development & Athletics $176.3M
  - 49 Buildings 1.63M GSF

Grounds, Infrastructure & Parking $21.0M

- Transitional

All Transitional Needs Addressed Since FY15
COVID Response in Higher Education
Covid-19: What Actions Are Other Schools Taking?

**SEC Meeting Highlights**

- **Current Actions:**
  - Rotating schedule for staff
  - Not testing their staff for Covid
  - Not doing temperature checks
- **Refunds:**
  - Almost all are refunding room and board
  - Some are refunding a portion of tuition
- **Thoughts on FY21:**
  - Opening up in the fall – split responses: 1/3 neg, 1/3 pos, 1/3 neutral
  - Do big lecture halls go away? Some schools considering this.
  - Will social distancing require more space?
  - Faculty worried about teaching in a room with a bunch of students

**UMASS Meeting Highlights**

- **Changes to Daily Life on Campus:**
  - Rotating schedule for staff – no cross contamination between groups
  - Staff have to fill out survey about symptoms each day before starting work
  - Masks: encouraged on campus. Some are supplying masks to high risk workers (high-risk from how they have to work).
  - Have locked down as much space as possible and monitoring who swipes into what building.
  - They are not able to do temperature checks.
- **Confirmed Case Actions:**
  - If a staff member is confirmed with Covid – anyone who was within 6 ft for 15 mins or more gets tested (CDC guidelines).
  - Hiring contracted cleaners to clean the buildings after any confirmed cases
- **Weekly Meetings:**
  - Meeting weekly to share best practices
  - Zoom calls twice a week to allow staff to share any concerns with leadership
SLAC Meeting Highlights

• **Current Situation and Actions:**
  - Campuses in various states of close, but most pretty empty
  - Dealing with many student belongings left on campuses.
  - Facilities staff not working on site except minimally necessary
  - Many providing space to house first responders who aren’t going home to family
  - Summer programs mostly cancelled
  - Construction activity varies by jurisdiction
  - Construction being curtailed to preserve cash
  - Wide variety of commencement/reunion plans from slight to one year deferrals
  - Trying to start aligning present actions with future implications.

• **Planning for FY21**
  - Most planning for both online and on site teaching in fall
  - Some actually concerned about lack of space if not abroad programs for students this fall
  - Significant budget concerns in coming year and several years to follow
Appendix
Comparing Grounds Coverage to Research & Jesuit Peers

Grounds coverage more comparable to Jesuit peers, although both peer group averages below database average.

**Grounds Coverage Ratio vs. Research Peers**
(FY19)

**Grounds Coverage Ratio vs. Jesuit Peers**
(FY19)

Arrayed by grounds intensity
SLU Energy Unit Cost by Fuel Type

Electric unit cost has risen over time, while fossil unit cost has decreased.
Energy Consumption Compared to Peers

When accounting for weather, SLU consumes less energy than peers on average.