

1/28/2019

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

I.3. Capital Planning and Budget Committee

Thursday, February 7, 2019

10:45 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

UW-Madison, Union South, 2nd floor

Varsity Hall I

1308 W. Dayton Street, Madison, Wisconsin

- a. Approval of the Minutes of the December 6, 2018 Meeting of the Capital Planning and Budget Committee
- b. UW System: Authority to Construct an All Agency Maintenance and Repair Project [Resolution I.3.b.]
- c. UW System: Approval of the Evaluation Criteria for Major Capital Project Requests [Resolution I.3.c.]
- d. UW-Eau Claire: Authority to Execute the Remainder of the Design Contract and Construct the UW Managed Simpson Field Enhancement Project [Resolution I.3.d.]
- e. UW-Madison: Authority to Execute the Remainder of the Design Contract and Construct the UW Managed Biochemistry Electron Microscopes Project [Resolution I.3.e.]
- f. UW-Madison Presentation: *Supporting Facilities Operations and Maintenance at UW- Madison*
- g. Report of the Associate Vice President
 1. State Building Commission
 2. Other Updates

Authority to Construct an All
Agency Maintenance and Repair
Project, UW System

CAPITAL PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

Resolution:

That, upon the recommendation of the President of the University of Wisconsin System, authority be granted to construct an All Agency maintenance and repair project at an estimated total cost of \$660,000 Agency Cash.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

**REQUEST FOR
BOARD OF REGENTS ACTION
FEBRUARY 2019**

INSTITUTION: University of Wisconsin System

PROJECT REQUEST: Authority to construct a maintenance and repair project at an estimated total cost of \$660,000 Agency Cash.

FACILITY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR

INST	PROJ. NO.	PROJECT TITLE	GFSB	PRSB	CASH	GIFT/GRANT	TOTAL
RVF	18F1W	South Fork Suites Shower Surround Repl			\$ 660,000		\$ 660,000
FMR SUBTOTALS			\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 660,000	\$ 0	\$ 660,000

GFSB	PRSB	CASH	GIFT/GRANT	TOTAL
\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 660,000	\$ 0	\$ 660,000

FEBRUARY 2019 TOTALS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Facility Maintenance and Repair Requests

RVF – South Fork Suites Shower Surround Replacements (\$660,000): This project resolves continuous water leak issues and maintenance costs associated with the cracked shower pans. Project work includes replacing 56 one-piece fiberglass shower surrounds and four ADA accessible showers with new site-fabricated showers. The old fiberglass shower surrounds will be disposed. All floor, wall, and ceiling finishes disturbed will be restored to match existing.

South Fork Suites opened in Fall 2005 and within six months, the floors of the shower surrounds began cracking. Twenty surrounds were repaired by August of 2006. In July of 2009, all ADA type surrounds were repaired by drilling holes in the floor and filling the space between the subfloor and surround with a resin paste, then resealing the floor. Most of the showers now have an adhered mat installed to seal the cracks in the surround floors, but those too, are failing. Since the shower floors are not rigid, all repairs are only temporary. It was determined that the original installer did not include a mortar bed as required. This incorrect installation procedure voided the manufacturer's warranty. Leaking showers have caused drywall damage to the suites below. Repairs do not last long because the leaks cannot be permanently resolved and there are growing concerns about the potential of mold growth.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION:

UW System Administration continues to work with each institution to develop a comprehensive campus physical development plan, including infrastructure maintenance planning. After a thorough review and consideration of All Agency Project proposals and infrastructure planning issues submitted, as well as the UW All Agency Projects Program funding targets set by the

Division of Facilities Development, this request represents high priority University of Wisconsin System infrastructure maintenance, repair, renovation, and upgrade needs. This request focuses on existing facilities and utilities, targets the known maintenance needs, and addresses outstanding health and safety issues. Where possible, similar work throughout a single facility or across multiple facilities has been combined into a single request to provide more efficient project management and project execution.

BUDGET AND SCHEDULE:

General Fund Supported Borrowing.....	\$	0
Program Revenue Supported Borrowing		0
Gifts and Grants.....		0
Agency Cash.....	\$	<u>660,000</u>
Total Requested Budget	\$	660,000

PREVIOUS ACTION: None.

Approval of the Evaluation Criteria
for Major Capital Project Requests,
UW System

CAPITAL PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

Resolution:

That, upon the recommendation of the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Evaluation Criteria for Major Capital Project Requests be adopted as the basis for prioritizing major capital projects for inclusion in UW System capital budget requests.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA
for
MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECT REQUESTS**

BACKGROUND

Each biennium, System Administration staff apply approved evaluation criteria to the major capital project requests submitted by each institution for consideration in the next UW System capital budget request to the Department of Administration. Approved criteria have been applied in this manner since the 1999-2001 biennium and they have been periodically updated and enhanced as needed to reflect current systemwide initiatives, priorities, and goals of the Board of Regents. Last updated in February 2017, these criteria assist in developing a biennial capital budget request and a six-year capital plan that address the most critical needs, highest academic priorities, and most cost-effective solutions to maintain and develop each institution's physical environment.

REQUESTED ACTION

That the Board of Regents adopts Resolution I.3.c., authorizing the use of the criteria as defined in Appendix A for the evaluation of Major Capital Project Requests for all funding sources and construction authority models.

DISCUSSION

The majority of proposed modifications to the evaluation criteria are intended to clarify and enhance the definition of existing individual criterion, to promote a more uniform understanding systemwide, and to foster a more consistent application in practice. All of the criteria used with associated scoring or points have been completely rewritten, although their individual and collective intents remain the same. The only remnants remaining of the previously approved criteria are the individual criterion titles.

The primary focus of the clarifying and enhanced language is to acknowledge that there are not only positive impacts to the proposed scopes of work, should they ultimately be funded, but also negative impacts to endure, if the requests are not funded. In order to compel and solicit from each institution the desired and required information to that end, it is necessary to revise the language used to define each section and individual criterion. The previous edition of the evaluation criteria focused primarily on articulating only the positive aspects and impacts of a proposed scope of work. The resulting project request documents therefore primarily articulated that one-sided and optimistic view. More balanced and compelling request documents can be achieved by describing and comparing the existing state vs. proposed state of facilities. The proposed modifications to the evaluation criteria establish that intent and facilitate the ability to improve future capital budget requests and individual major capital project requests.

In addition to the clarifying and enhanced language proposed, the other proposed modifications are summarized as follows:

- Re-titles the collective criteria from *Major Capital Projects Evaluation Criteria* to *Evaluation Criteria for Major Capital Project Requests*.
- Re-titles the section previously known as *Institutional Priority* to *Capital Plan Considerations*.
- Replaces individual criterion for *Project Sequence*, *Highest Rank for Last Biennium*, and *Highest Rank for the Last Two Biennia* with a new criterion titled as *Capital Budget Request Deferral* to recognize unfunded requests already included in a previous Board of Regents capital budget request and to place those unfunded requests on equal footing with each institution's current highest ranked priority.
- Re-titles the section previously known as *Physical Development Considerations* to *Physical Development Impacts* to recognize the potential positive and negative impacts a proposed scope of work may have, depending on its ultimate funding status.
- Re-titles the individual criterion previously known as *Demolition* to *Capital Maintenance Elimination or Deferral* and converts this criterion's scoring from a subjective staff scoring application to an objective formula calculation based upon the percentage and ratio of project space to be razed or demolished in comparison to new construction or replacement space.
- Re-distributes and equalizes potential points in the *Physical Development Impacts* section among the four unique criteria to further emphasize and encourage the demolition of deteriorated, obsolete, and unsuitable space.
- Re-titles the section previously known as *Program Considerations* to *Programmatic Impacts* to recognize the potential positive and negative impacts a proposed scope of work may have, depending on its ultimate funding status.
- Re-titles the individual criterion previously known as *Operational Impact* to *Operations and Operating Budget Impact* and migrates this criterion sequentially to the first position in this section.
- Re-titles the individual criterion previously known as *Functionality* to *Space Quality, Performance, and Suitability* and migrates this criterion sequentially to the second position in this section.
- Re-titles the individual criterion previously known as *Space Need* to *Space Quantity, Availability, and Capacity*.
- Re-distributes and equalizes potential points in the *Programmatic Impacts* section among the four unique criteria to emphasize and encourage thorough analysis and consideration of the potential operating budget impacts of the proposed scopes of work.

Considering the magnitude of major capital project requests made each biennium, these updated evaluation criteria will be applied to assist in the determination of systemwide priority, inclusion in future biennial capital budget requests, and sequencing of future six-year capital plans.

System Administration has not yet received capital budget instructions from the Department of Administration. It is expected that additional guidelines, which may be established by the Department of Administration, will be addressed in the context of the foregoing framework.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
EVALUATION CRITERIA for MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECT REQUESTS

PART I: These evaluation criteria apply to all requests for new assignable* square footage, regardless of funding source(s). Project requests seeking to add additional assignable square footage **must meet at least one of the following four criteria** to advance further for capital budget consideration. If the net new square footage‡ prerequisite is satisfied, then the project request will continue through the remaining evaluation criteria and process. Each institution must provide demonstrated proof that no other appropriate facilities are available to accommodate the proposed expansion needs.

* Assignable square footage does not include any circulation; restrooms; mechanical or electrical rooms; structural areas; or building service areas.

‡ Net new square footage does not include replace-in-kind, even if the replacement space is larger than the original space due to current construction and facility standards and practices. This only applies to new square footage purely for program creation or expansion purposes.

SCORING	NET NEW SQUARE FOOTAGE PREREQUISITE	4 Criteria
Yes or No	FACILITY STANDARDS AND COMPLIANCE: The institution has demonstrated and documented building codes and/or standards compliance issues and/or health, safety, and environmental issues would not be resolved through standard design and operating practice. The project scope must include extraordinary or non-routine conditions and examples to be resolved, as documented by a planning study such as: Campus Master or Precinct/College Plan, Facility Condition Assessment, or Pre-Design/Feasibility.	
Yes or No	ACADEMIC PROGRAM AND ENROLLMENT GROWTH: The institution has identified demonstrated space shortages related to Board of Regents approved academic program creation or expansion with the following: 5-year enrollment trends responding to strategic or programmatic needs and a targeted space utilization analysis showing use consistently beyond UWSA standards, and/or evidence that enrollment exceeds original building design capacity. The project documentation must be accompanied by market studies as appropriate and operational impact reports, historical enrollment data, and sound financial plans.	
Yes or No	REVENUE-BASED INITIATIVES: The institution has identified and demonstrated space shortages related to the need of additional residence hall beds, dining capacity, parking, or other student-supported and engagement space, and/or community-based initiatives. Project documentation must include market studies as appropriate and financial analysis, debt service payment schedules, and sound business plans.	
Yes or No	EFFECTIVE USE OF CAPITAL AND OPERATING RESOURCES: The institution has identified and demonstrated that the existing facilities are insufficient, dysfunctional, and no longer cost effective to operate and maintain. The project documentation provides a Building Condition Assessment demonstrating poor adaptive reuse potential for its intended purpose and a cost to upgrade, renovate, and repair that exceeds 75% of replacement cost.	

PART II: These evaluation criteria apply to all Major Project requests, regardless of funding source(s). The categories and criteria were established by determining distinguishing factors of project requests. Some criteria are entirely objective; either the project request meets the criteria definitions or it doesn't. Other criteria are subjective; the criteria definitions are partially met or the degree to which they are met is open to interpretation. Only those projects ranked each biennium will be used to gauge the range of possible points given for the subjective criteria; there are no absolute standards for maximum points awarded. Subjective points will be an assigned consensus value by the group of evaluators. If all the capital project prerequisites are satisfied, then the project request will continue through the remaining evaluation process.

SCORING	CAPITAL PROJECT PREREQUISITES	5 Requirements
Yes or No	NET NEW SQUARE FOOTAGE: If the proposed project includes new assignable square footage, the institution has met the net new square footage prerequisite.	
Yes or No	EVIDENCE OF PLANNING: The institution has demonstrated and documented previous indication(s) and intent(s) for the majority of project scope through one or more of the following items: Campus Master or Capital Plan, Facility Condition Assessment, Feasibility Study, Project Priority and Sequence Chart, Pre-Design, Space Use Study.	
Yes or No	INSTITUTIONAL READINESS: The institution has demonstrated and documented its ability and capacity to execute and manage the proposed project within the context of the proposed six-year institutional capital plan and in or by the proposed biennium through the following items: (a) fully documented and submitted six-year institutional capital plan; (b) surge space identified and reallocated or reserved as necessary; and (c) appropriate and adequate operational resources identified and documented to operate and maintain the resulting capital asset(s).	
Yes or No	INFRASTRUCTURE IMPACT: The institution has identified and requested, if necessary, the required additional site infrastructure/utility funding commitments, and/or those have been included in their Capital Plan in the biennium prior to, and/or in the same biennium as the project.	

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
EVALUATION CRITERIA for MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECT REQUESTS

PART III: These evaluation criteria reflect the institution's highest priority for the current biennial capital planning cycle and recognize those requests from the previous biennial planning cycle that were included in the Board of Regents capital budget request, but remain unfunded.

SCORING	CAPITAL PLAN CONSIDERATIONS	20 Points
0 or 10 pts	INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITY: The institution has identified and documented the project as the institution's highest priority Major Capital Project Request for the proposed six-year institutional capital plan.	
0 or 10 pts	CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST DEFERRAL: The identified project was included in the previous BOR approved biennial capital budget request to the State of Wisconsin Department of Administration, but was subsequently not funded in the State of Wisconsin's biennial budget.	

PART IV: These evaluation criteria define the significant and measurable areas of physical development and programmatic impacts for each requested Major Capital Project Request, and serve as the means by which to prioritize all proposed inclusions of the Board of Regents Six-Year Capital Plan. Each criterion defined below provides the opportunity to articulate (a) the advantage(s), benefit(s), and positive impact(s) that will result if the proposed project is funded in the requested biennium and (b) the consequence(s), hardship(s), and negative impact(s) that will result if the proposed project is not funded in the requested biennium.

SCORING	PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS	40 Points
0 - 10 pts	<p>CODES, STANDARDS, HEALTH & SAFETY: How the existing vs. proposed facility status relates to and addresses, improves, and/or resolves demonstrated and documented...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Building code citations, conflicts, and/or retroactive enforcements. ◆ Physical development and/or environment standards of program space. ◆ Health, safety, or protection of the physical and natural environment. 	
0 - 10 pts	<p>CAPITAL MAINTENANCE ELIMINATION or DEFERRAL: Formula calculation and the ratio of demolished/razed space vs. new/replacement construction of the same or equivalent space type(s) and funding source(s). This criteria scores the quantity ratio and percentage of demolished/razed space vs. new/replacement space for the entire request.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Up to full credit for demolishing/razing more square footage than new/replacement space. ◆ Partial credit for demolishing/razing equal or less square footage than new/replacement space. ◆ No credit for scope of work that includes only new/replacement space. 	
0 - 10 pts	<p>CAPITAL RENEWAL: Formula calculation and the ratio of the budget estimate dedicated to renovation vs. new/replacement space. This criteria scores the degree (\$/GSF) and percentage of proposed total project budget that is dedicated to renovation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Full credit for 100% of the budget estimate that is dedicated to renovation. No new/replacement construction of program space. ◆ Partial credit for budget estimates that include both renovation and new/replacement program space. ◆ No credit for budget estimates that includes only new/replacement program space. 	
0 - 10 pts	<p>FACILITY REUSE: Formula calculation and the ratio of project space that is dedicated to renovation vs. new/replacement space. This criteria scores the quantity ratio and percentage of proposed total project space that is dedicated to renovation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Full credit for 100% of the scope of work that is dedicated to renovation. No new/replacement construction of program space. ◆ Partial credit for scope of work that includes both renovation and new/replacement construction of program space. ◆ No credit for scope of work that includes only new/replacement construction of program space. 	

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
EVALUATION CRITERIA for MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECT REQUESTS

SCORING	PROGRAMMATIC IMPACTS	40 Points
0 - 10 pts	<p>OPERATIONS and OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT: How the existing vs. proposed program space status relates to and addresses, improves, and/or resolves through consolidation, reorganization, and/or relocation...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Operational efficiency, staffing requirements, and/or program accreditation(s) and/or certification(s). ◆ Operating budget estimates and analysis, plans, projections, savings, and reallocations. ◆ Recruitment, retention, and training of faculty, staff, and students. 	
0 - 10 pts	<p>SPACE QUALITY, PERFORMANCE, and SUITABILITY: How the existing vs. proposed program space status relates to and addresses, improves, and/or resolves the overall quality, performance, and suitability of the program space through demonstrated and documented functional and technological requirements, spatial configurations, and/or adjacency of space...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Where <u>quality</u> is defined as the condition, fit and finish, and equipment/technology level for its intended purpose(s) and program(s). ◆ Where <u>performance</u> is defined as how the space functions for its intended purpose(s) and programs(s). ◆ Where <u>suitability</u> is defined as how appropriate the space is for its intended purpose(s) and program(s). <p>...and impacts the institution's mission, student graduation rate, and intended program delivery and development needs.</p>	
0 - 10 pts	<p>SPACE QUANTITY, AVAILABILITY, and CAPACITY: How the existing vs. proposed program space status relates to and addresses, improves, and/or resolves the overall quantity, availability, and or capacity of space through demonstrated and documented program and data analysis...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Where <u>quantity</u> is defined as the number of program spaces for the intended purpose(s), regardless of size or availability of spaces. ◆ Where <u>availability</u> is defined as adequate time periods to schedule instruction, regardless of number or size of spaces. ◆ Where <u>capacity</u> is defined as the desired or optimal occupancy and/or student station count for scheduled instruction, regardless of number or availability of spaces. <p>...and impacts the institution's mission, student graduation rate, and intended program delivery and development needs.</p>	
0 - 10 pts	<p>SPACE UTILIZATION: How the existing vs. proposed program space status relates to and addresses, improves, and/or resolves the overall use of space for scheduled instruction through demonstrated and documented program and data analysis, including...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Surplus, surge, and/or underutilized space. ◆ Overprescribed space and utilization rates above space type standards and requirements. ◆ Projected space use for new program space that does not already exist. <p>...and impacts the institution's mission, student graduation rate, and intended program delivery and development needs.</p>	

**THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS EVALUATION CRITERIA**

PART I: These evaluation criteria apply to all requests for new assignable* square footage, regardless of funding source(s). Project requests seeking to add additional assignable square footage **must meet at least one of the following four criteria** to advance further for capital budget consideration. If the net new square footage‡ prerequisite is satisfied, then the project request will continue through the remaining evaluation criteria and process. Each institution must provide demonstrated proof that no other appropriate facilities are available to accommodate the proposed expansion needs.

* Assignable square footage does not include any circulation; restrooms; mechanical or electrical rooms; structural areas; or building service areas.

‡ Net new square footage does not include replace-in-kind, even if the replacement space is larger than the original space due to current construction and facility standards and practices. This only applies to new square footage purely for program creation or expansion purposes.

SCORING	NET NEW SQUARE FOOTAGE PREREQUISITE	4 Criteria
Yes or No	FACILITY STANDARDS AND COMPLIANCE: The institution has demonstrated and documented building codes and/or standards compliance issues and/or health, safety, and environmental issues would not be resolved through standard design and operating practice. The project scope must include extraordinary or non-routine conditions and examples to be resolved, as documented by a planning study such as: Campus Master or Precinct/College Plan, Facility Condition Assessment, and Pre-Design/Feasibility.	
Yes or No	ACADEMIC PROGRAM AND ENROLLMENT GROWTH: The institution has identified demonstrated space shortages related to Board of Regents approved academic program creation or expansion with the following: 5-year enrollment trends responding to strategic or programmatic needs and a targeted space utilization analysis showing use consistently beyond UWSA standards, and/or evidence that enrollment exceeds original building design capacity. The project documentation must be accompanied by market studies as appropriate and operational impact reports, historical enrollment data, and sound financial plans.	
Yes or No	REVENUE-BASED INITIATIVES: The institution has identified and demonstrated space shortages related to the need of additional residence hall beds, dining capacity, parking, or other student- supported and engagement space, and/or community-based initiatives. Project documentation must include market studies as appropriate and financial analysis, debt service payment schedules, and sound business plans.	
Yes or No	EFFECTIVE USE OF CAPITAL AND OPERATING RESOURCES: The institution has identified and demonstrated that the existing facilities are insufficient, dysfunctional, and no longer cost effective to operate and maintain. The project documentation provides a Building Condition Assessment demonstrating poor adaptive reuse potential for its intended purpose and a cost to upgrade, renovate and repair that exceeds 75% of replacement cost.	

PART II: These evaluation criteria apply to all Major Project requests, regardless of funding source(s). The categories and criteria were established by determining distinguishing factors of project requests. Some criteria are entirely objective; either the project request meets the criteria definition or it doesn't. Other criteria are subjective; the criteria definition is partially met or the degree to which the criteria definition is met is open to interpretation. Only those projects ranked each biennium will be used to gauge the range of possible points given for the subjective criteria; there are no absolute standards for maximum points awarded. Subjective points will be an assigned consensus value by the group of evaluators. If all the capital project prerequisites are satisfied, then the project request will continue through the remaining evaluation criteria and process.

SCORING	CAPITAL PROJECT PREREQUISITES	5 Requirements
Yes or No	NET NEW SQUARE FOOTAGE: If the proposed project includes new assignable square footage, the institution has met the net new square footage prerequisite.	
Yes or No	EVIDENCE OF PLANNING: The institution has demonstrated and documented previous indication(s) and intent(s) for the majority of project scope through one or more of the following items: Campus Master or Capital Plan, Facility Condition Assessment, Feasibility Study, Project Priority and Sequence Chart, Pre-Design, Space Use Study.	
Yes or No	INSTITUTIONAL READINESS: The institution has demonstrated and documented its ability and capacity to execute and manage the proposed project within the context of the proposed six-year institutional capital plan and in or by the proposed biennium through the following items: (a) fully documented and submitted six-year institutional capital plan; (b) surge space identified and reallocated or reserved as necessary; and (c) appropriate and adequate operational resources identified and documented to operate and maintain the resulting capital asset(s).	
Yes or No	INFRASTRUCTURE IMPACT: The institution has identified and requested, if necessary, the required additional site infrastructure/utility funding commitments and/or those have been included in the Capital Plan in the biennium prior to, and/or in the same biennium as the project.	

**THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS EVALUATION CRITERIA**

PART III

SCORING	INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITY	20 Points
0 or 10 pts	HIGHEST RANK FOR CURRENT BIENNIUM: The institution ranked the project as its highest priority Major Project Request for the current biennium within the context of the proposed six-year institutional capital plan.	
0 or 5 pts	HIGHEST RANK FOR LAST BIENNIUM: The institution ranked the project as its highest priority Major Project Request for last biennium within the context of the proposed six-year institutional capital plan.	
0 or 3 pts	HIGHEST RANK FOR THE LAST TWO BIENNIA: The institution ranked the project as its highest priority Major Project Request for the last two biennia within the context of the proposed six-year institutional capital plan.	
0 or 2 pts	PROJECT SEQUENCE: Project must be completed prior to other projects identified in the proposed six-year institutional capital plan.	

SCORING	PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS	40 Points
0 - 5 pts	CODES, STANDARDS, HEALTH & SAFETY: Project resolves demonstrated and documented building codes and/or standards compliance issues and/or health, safety, and environmental issues that would not be resolved through standard design practice and appropriate design standards. The project scope must include extraordinary or non-routine conditions and examples that need resolution.	
0 - 10 pts	DEMOLITION: Project eliminates demonstrated and documented capital maintenance or avoids anticipated future capital maintenance through demolition of space that is deteriorated, obsolete, and/or has no viable reuse.	
0 - 15 pts	CAPITAL RENEWAL: Project renews demonstrated and documented capital maintenance and/or anticipated future capital maintenance through renovation. Project scopes including only remodeled/renovated space receive full credit. Project scopes including new ancillary spaces and/or non-assignable spaces (elevators, mechanical rooms, restrooms, etc.) are not penalized. Project scopes including remodeled/renovated space + new assignable space receive partial credit. Partial credit scoring will be based on cost (\$) ratio of remodeled/renovated space to new space included in the project.	
0 - 10 pts	FACILITY REUSE: Existing space is adequate and appropriate for renovation; no new assignable space required. Project scopes including only remodeled/renovated space receive full credit. Project scopes including new ancillary spaces and/or non-assignable spaces (elevators, mechanical rooms, restrooms, etc.) are not penalized. Project scopes including remodeled/renovated space + new assignable space receive partial credit. Partial credit scoring will be based on space (GSF) ratio of remodeled/renovated space to new space included in the project.	

SCORING	PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS	40 Points
0 - 15 pts	FUNCTIONALITY: Project provides new/improved program space functionality through configuration, relocation, or technology. The project scope includes one or more of the following items for new/improved functionality: (a) area(s)/technology specifically designed/implemented and/or (b) remodeled/renovated/relocated.	
0 - 5 pts	OPERATIONAL IMPACT: Project improves operational efficiencies through consolidation, reorganization, and/or relocation and supports sustainability. The project scope includes one or more of the following items to improve operational efficiency: (a) program space(s) and/or technology specifically designed and/or implemented, and/or (b) remodeling/renovation/relocation with (1) demonstrated operational budget reductions and/or projections as a result of completing this project and/or (2) demonstrated resource reallocation to accommodate any new net square footage constructed.	
0 - 15 pts	SPACE NEED: Project targets and resolves demonstrated space shortages. The project scope includes one or more of the following items to meet demonstrated space shortages: (a) program space(s)/technology specifically designed/implemented and/or (b) remodeling/renovation/relocation.	
0 - 5 pts	SPACE UTILIZATION: Project demonstrates improved space utilization for scheduled program space and/or makes use of underutilized space. The project scope includes one or more of the following items to improve space utilization: (a) program space(s) specifically designed to replace underutilized assigned/surplus space with assigned space and/or (b) remodeling/renovation/relocation.	

Authority to Execute the Remainder
of the Design Contract and Construct
the UW Managed Simpson Field
Enhancement Project, UW-Eau
Claire

CAPITAL PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

Resolution:

That, upon the recommendation of the UW-Eau Claire Chancellor and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, authority be granted to execute the remainder of the design contract and construct the Simpson Field Enhancement project for a total cost of \$2,000,000 Gift Funds.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

**REQUEST FOR
BOARD OF REGENTS ACTION
February 2019**

INSTITUTION: University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

REQUEST: Authority to execute the remainder of the design contract and construct the Simpson Field Enhancement project for a total cost of \$2,000,000 Gift Funds.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project will replace the existing, crowned grass Simpson Field with synthetic turf, install lighting around the track, and provide improvements to accommodate track field events.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION:

Simpson Field is used as a practice field for the university's football program. The large crown in the middle of the field and general uneven nature of the surface make it unsafe for practice, particularly when the field becomes wet. The football program currently utilizes a City of Eau Claire field to play their home games. All the non Eau Claire fields are synthetic turf, therefore installation of a new turf field will provide a consistent playing and training surface.

Despite not hosting a track meet in over 15 years, the UW-Eau Claire Track and Field Program regularly competes at a nationally competitive level in NCAA Division III Outdoor Track and Field competitions. Improvements to Simpson Field would allow the university to host events, by having a positive impact on program revenue, since the track and field program is one of the university's largest and most successful athletic programs.

BUDGET:

Construction	\$1,600,000
Design	\$155,300
Contingency	\$160,000
Equipment and Fees	\$84,700
TOTAL	\$2,000,000

PREVIOUS ACTION:

None.

Authority to Execute the Remainder
of the Design Contract and Construct
the UW Managed Biochemistry
Electron Microscopes Project,
UW-Madison

CAPITAL PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

Resolution:

That, upon the recommendation of the UW-Madison Chancellor and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, authority be granted to execute the remainder of the design contract and construct the Biochemistry Electron Microscopes project for a total project cost of \$1,800,000 Gift/Grant Funding.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

**REQUEST FOR
BOARD OF REGENTS ACTION
FEBRUARY 2019**

INSTITUTION: UW-Madison

REQUEST: Authority to execute the remainder of the design contract and construct the UW managed Biochemistry Electron Microscopes project for a total project cost of \$1,800,000 Gift/Grant Funding.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project seeks to remodel space within the DeLuca Biochemistry Building to accommodate two new electron microscopes. The two microscopes require vibration, acoustic, and electromagnetic interference (EMI) treatments within the spaces. The spaces also require precise temperature and relative humidity controls to accommodate the new equipment. Dedicated rooms and anterooms will be created to help control temperature swings in addition to dedicated air handlers, dehumidifiers and cooling panels. A pre-action fire suppression system will be installed throughout the new lab space. Due to the size of one of the microscopes, the entrance into the building will need to be temporarily modified with the removal and reinstallation of existing storefront to allow for delivery.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION:

This past summer, the Department of Biochemistry hired a faculty member who specializes in cryo-electron microscopy and she will become the director of the department's newly established cryo-electron microscopy facility. Recruiting this professor is an important opportunity for UW-Madison to establish a highly visible presence in this research field.

BUDGET AND SCHEDULE:

Construction	\$1,265,000
Design	\$200,000
Contingency	\$194,000
Equipment	\$90,000
Other Fee	\$51,000
TOTAL	\$1,800,000

BOR Approval	Feb 2019
Bid Opening	Apr 2019
Start Construction	Jun 2019
Substantial Completion	Nov 2019
Final Completion	Jan 2020

PREVIOUS ACTION:

None.