

Integrated Facilities Assessment:

A POSITIVE APPROACH TO MAKING
THE BUSINESS CASE FOR FACILITY NEEDS



by Paul Tankel and Ronald P. Gilmore

The dean needs a new academic building; the residence halls need renovation and, to continue to attract quality students, you need improved student life and athletic facilities; the research programs are expanding; and additional patient care space and equipment modernization must be funded in the medical center. And all of the above must be supported with improved information management technology.

Sound familiar?

Most of us operate in a world of scarce resources. Over the past few years the stock market has suppressed endowment growth, gifts and pledges have slowed, and government support has diminished. At the same time competition for available (and scarce) resources has been increasing. The natural result is that one of the age-old challenges faced by educational facilities officers—"How do you make the case for spending on your facilities in a positive and realistic way?"—has intensified significantly.

At the University of Rochester, that question is answered with a communications tool we call the Integrated Facilities Assessment (IFA). This is a single document that provides a holistic, long-term view of the entire physical plant, while

facilities, while keeping pace with the infrastructure needs of new programs.

Funding for major maintenance and capital renewal often competes for the same funds used to construct space for new programs, and, of course, a "new building" boom can produce an increased backlog of deferred maintenance elsewhere. To compound this situation we, like everyone, are experiencing higher utility costs, increased government regulation, and the need to accommodate the ever changing and ever increasing needs for information technology. There is also pressure to compromise quality during design throughout the "value engineering" process. Additionally, some of the innovative materials and construction techniques, which were hailed as improvements during the 1960s and 1970s, are now showing signs of systems failure.

The Integrated Facility Assessment spreadsheet on page 52 has proved its worth in these times. What most profoundly differentiates the IFA from the traditional facilities matrixes is the expansion of the "program" category. Within the realm of program requirements the range of need varies. From office renovations to the revitalization of the student activities center or a major renovation of a science and technology facility,

The natural result is that one of the age-old challenges faced by educational facilities officers—"How do you make the case for spending on your facilities in a positive and realistic way?"—has intensified significantly.

also identifying the specific and immediate needs of each program. This document goes far beyond deferred maintenance; it quantifies all of the major infrastructure categories that comprise an overall facility need. The IFA identifies the demands for such issues as deferred maintenance, life safety, code compliance, accessibility, hazardous material, information technology, and security, along with the integration of current and future program requirements.

Complex times demand more sophisticated analyses of demands for facilities improvements. Having seen considerable growth over the past 50 years, our university is a good example of the current environment for most institutions. Approximately 68 percent of the university's 10.4-million gross square feet has been constructed since 1950. Governance of the university is significantly decentralized, with the Facilities Group remaining as one of the few service organizations that span our academic campus, medical center, music school, and art gallery. We continue to be challenged to maintain our

the changing "program vision" impacts the usage and efficiency of a facility as well as how its space is managed. By reviewing facilities in this way the split between facilities and the mission of the institution is removed and the "total need" of the university can be reviewed in order to develop a more comprehensive long-range plan.

In 1995, the university contracted for an assessment of its academic campus and medical center. We then established a deferred maintenance program to manage our facility information and assist with capital planning. Two years ago, we decided that in order to adequately evaluate our physical plant and incorporate program needs we needed to expand the scope of our assessment program. At the same time, the university architect was beginning to work with the College of Arts, Sciences, and Engineering—the principal division on our academic campus—to develop a list of needs that would shape its impending capital campaign. The assessment program was then placed under the direction of the university architect, and the IFA was first implemented.

Since then, the IFA has evolved into a series of Excel spreadsheets that begins with a summary of each campus' facilities as the primary display, providing a snapshot view of one's entire facility and program requirements on a single matrix. A second, and sometimes third layer of worksheets are linked to the summary matrix so that in-depth facility infrastructure and systems information that exists in multiple databases may be reviewed. Conducting facility assessments

Paul Tankel is the university architect for the University of Rochester, Rochester, New York and can be reached at ptankel@facilities.rochester.edu. Contributing author Ron Gilmore is the facility condition assessment program manager for the University of Rochester and can be reached at rgilmore@facilities.rochester.edu. This is their first article for Facilities Manager.

The University of Rochester Integrated Facility Assessment

| FACILITY NAME | GROSS SF | ASSIGNABLE SF | LAB SPACE SF | YEAR BUILT | CRV | USAGE | # OF FLOORS | INSP DATE | TOTAL CR/DM | ITS | ADA | ASBESTOS | HAZ MAT | LIFE SAFETY | SECURITY | PROGRAM | CONTINGENCY | IDENTIFIED TOTAL NEED | PHASE I TOTAL COST | PHASE II TOTAL COST |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------|------------|-----|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-----|-----|----------|---------|-------------|----------|---------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| BURTON HALL | 33,843 | 27,250 | 0 | 1930 | | DORMITORY | 4 | 3/26/2002 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| COMPUTER STUDIES | 121,294 | 69,124 | 7,909 | 1987 | | ACADEMIC | 8 | 6/18/1998 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DANFORTH DINNING | 35,205 | 21,127 | 0 | 1955 | | AUXILARY | 2 | 10/16/1995 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DRAMA HOUSE | 10,221 | 6,394 | 0 | 1929 | | DORMITORY | 4 | 4/19/2002 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FAUVER STADIUM | 91,935 | 42,965 | 0 | 1930 | | GYMNASIUM | 4 | 6/19/1997 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FREDERICK DOUGLASS BUILDING | 71,556 | 47,191 | 0 | 1955 | | AUXILARY | 4 | 6/16/1998 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GAVETT HALL | 119,851 | 45,372 | 13,891 | 1930 | | LABORATORY | 5 | 1/28/2000 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GEORGEN SPORTS COMPLEX | 316,848 | 152,016 | 0 | 1930 | | GYMNASIUM | 4 | 9/7/2001 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GILBERT HALL | 91,500 | 74,745 | 0 | 1959 | | DORMITORY | 4 | 4/17/2002 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HOPEMAN HALL | 57,518 | 34,132 | 15,755 | 1963 | | LABORATORY | 6 | 7/17/1998 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HOYT HALL | 16,983 | 9,965 | 0 | 1962 | | ACADEMIC | 3 | 12/8/1997 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HUTCHISON | 329,790 | 160,590 | 93,498 | 1972 | | LABORATORY | 6 | 8/17/1999 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HYLAN | 59,021 | 22,644 | 558 | 1971 | | ACADEMIC | 13 | 9/16/1999 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| INTERFAITH CHAPEL | 31,963 | 16,575 | 0 | 1960 | | CHAPEL | 5 | 8/26/1999 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LATTIMORE HALL | 71,545 | 41,064 | 582 | 1930 | | ACADEMIC | 6 | 9/1/2000 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LOVEJOY | 42,622 | 23,850 | 0 | 1954 | | DORMITORY | 4 | 4/17/2002 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MEEES OBSERVATORY | 743 | 743 | 0 | 1965 | | ACADEMIC | 2 | 9/25/2000 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MOREY HALL | 60,867 | 28,228 | 0 | 1930 | | ACADEMIC | 6 | 12/5/2000 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUNRO | 18,677 | 13,670 | 0 | 1969 | | DORMITORY | 5 | 4/4/2002 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RUSH RHEES LIBRARY | 378,187 | 241,099 | 0 | 1930 | | LIBRARY | 8 | 7/7/1998 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SAGE ARTS CENTER | 44,705 | 14,574 | 0 | 1962 | | ACADEMIC | 3 | 6/1/1999 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SLATER HALL | 26,497 | 21,158 | 0 | 1969 | | DORMITORY | 5 | 4/4/2002 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| STRONG AUDITORIUM | 49,929 | 18,334 | 0 | 1929 | | AUDITORIUM | 3 | 8/8/1998 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SUSAN B. ANTHONY | 179,521 | 112,353 | 0 | 1955 | | DORMITORY | 7 | 3/27/2002 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TODD UNION | 29,836 | 18,876 | 0 | 1929 | | AUXILARY | 3 | 7/17/1998 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WILSON COMMONS | 92,000 | 47,195 | 0 | 1976 | | AUXILARY | 6 | 11/2/2000 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 2,382,657 | 1,311,234 | 132,193 | NA | | NA | NA | NA | | | | | | | | | | | | |

that incorporate inspections, consultant studies, and interaction with the operations staff refreshes the information. We are currently developing an in-house software package to further consolidate facility data so that the IFA can become an even more effective tool.

The key to making this document truly useful is frequent and detailed communication between the senior facilities staff and program administrators, which results in a joint understanding of how the facilities and program requirements are linked and why the issues must be addressed simultaneously. This may appear relatively simple, straightforward, and easy to understand, yet it is quite a challenge to execute.

In the case of our College, the university architect met this challenge through a series of meetings with department chairs to review immediate and short-term (five-year) needs, followed by discussion with the College's dean to envision total requirements for the College and to extend the planning horizon to the 10- to 15-year range. This dialogue supported the development of a strategic planning document that in turn provided information to assist in structuring the College's capital campaign.

The Integrated Facility Assessment has been adaptable for use on all of our diverse campuses and continues to be a useful operational and strategic communications tool for facilities managers and administrators at all levels. This document is increasingly used to assess and prioritize facilities in light of program requirements, prioritize deferred maintenance, identify project options, and develop short-range and long-range capital budgets.

Additionally, the IFA is being used to provide background information in support of capital campaigns, structure for program growth discussions, and more widespread recognition that facilities needs are an integral part of strategic planning.

Finally, the true success has been our ability to maintain, or in some cases increase, funding for building infrastructure needs shown in the context of supporting program growth. 🏰