OBJECTIVE DEFINITIONS

PROVIDE QUALITY SPACES AND PLACES
World-class academics, research, and patient care are enabled and enhanced by world-class facilities and public spaces. We improve the aesthetics, functionality, and quality of spaces and places that help to define the UW experience. Through the prioritization of spaces and places by utilization, prominence, and need for improvement we, increase the quality of campus spaces and places.

ENGAGE ALL EMPLOYEES IN CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT
Employees have ideas, insight, and innovations that help us evolve, adapt, and innovate to thrive in a changing environment. To create a culture of natural workgroups and regular huddles, teams share thoughts, ideas, and best practices to improve the work on a daily basis. Facilities Services will mature the four key systems by embracing, accepting and implementing goal-focused ideas from all employees to create change.

EMBRACE A SAFE AND INJURY-FREE WORK ENVIRONMENT
We preserve and promote the health and welfare of our employees to deeply reinforce our commitment to the guiding principle of respecting every individual. By promoting and sustaining a safe, healthy, injury-free work environment, all employees identify and develop safe work practices and mitigate hazards in shared commitment to building a safe workplace where people care and protect one another.

HIRE, TRAIN, AND DEVELOP FOR EXCELLENCE
Sustained world-class service must reflect the continuing, collaborative effort of all units, functions and employees. We must reinforce a continuous learning organization, growing and developing our people so that they are empowered to implement the changes that accomplish our goals. “Right person, right job, right skills” set up employees for success through hiring, training, coaching and other growth opportunities.

DELIVER A CAMPUS READY FOR BUSINESS EACH DAY
So that the campus community can focus on achieving their purpose, Facilities Services delivers campus buildings and infrastructure to meet the requirements of the university. We optimize delivery of essential services and mitigate disruption when the unexpected occurs. By focusing on resilient systems and work processes, we deliver quality services, given events in and outside of our direct control.

BE EASY TO DO BUSINESS WITH
To allow our customers to focus on their missions, we make interactions with Facilities Services as efficient and customer focused as possible. We assess customer feedback and engage in proactive communications to continuously improve our processes.

CHAMPION ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP
Facilities Services delivers energy and manages infrastructure, which impacts the environment. Through innovation and collaboration, we actively conserve resources and are leaders in the University’s sustainability efforts.

DELIVER COST EFFECTIVE SERVICES
As stewards of public and student funds, we have an obligation to deliver the greatest possible value. We will accomplish this by empowering our employees to identify and implement solutions and efficiencies to reduce cost and increase value through process improvements.

RECOGNIZE AND CELEBRATE INDIVIDUAL AND TEAM CONTRIBUTIONS
To develop a world-class culture that appreciates individual and team contributions to Facilities Services success and reputation, we celebrate accomplishments and recognize behavior that closely align to and promote organizational excellence.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Facilities Services Management System, or How We Improve, utilizes a mix of Balanced Scorecard (BSC) and Lean Systems to align staff and processes around achieving the vision of becoming a world-class organization providing exceptional service, anytime, anywhere. Nearly all strategies utilizing BSC are developed around the alignment of objectives and measures to four themes – customer experience, innovation, internal capacity and financial stewardship. Objectives provide general goals such as “be easy to do business with” while measures directly support those goals with key performance indicators (KPIs). Targets for the KPIs are typically set above benchmarks and increase in difficulty once a target has been met consistently. It is with that, we must note to all attendees of the BSC report out, that failing to meet the target is not necessarily negative, rather it indicates motion towards higher standards of excellence.

The Balanced Scorecard report is summarized by individual measures below.

CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE

C1.1 PREVENTIVE VS CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE
APPA has benchmarked “comprehensive stewardship” as a 75% preventive to 25% corrective maintenance ratio which has become Facilities Services future goal. This quarter FS reached 20.3% preventive maintenance, a record level, but much remains to be gained before hitting the target.

C1.2 REPAIR: FS VS CAMPUS IDENTIFIED
Measure C1.2 was developed to encourage employee identification of issues ahead of customer needs. For Q4 FY2017, the target of 60% was not met. The percentage of FS Employee identified issues dropped to 36%, caused mostly by data accuracy adjustments and a more user (customer) friendly website.

C1.3 RESILIENCE PLANNING
FS aims to increase emergency readiness through a Resilience Planning measure by tracking the status (implemented/up-to-date) of continuity plans throughout FS units. The measure is still in its planning stages, as the recruitment for a Continuity Support continues.

C2.1 GROUNDS RESOURCE UTILIZATION
Landscape areas around campus are prioritized and evaluated on pre-determined service level targets (high to low levels of maintenance and care). Grounds crew efforts impact APPA levels for these areas. This quarter crews exceeded their targeted goals.

C2.2: DESIGNATED BUILDING SPACES AT APPA LEVEL 1 or 2
Over 80 spaces have been identified as a priority for custodial units to maintain at the highest APPA levels. After a mishap last quarter resulting in the loss of all previous data sets, this measure is back on track to begin benchmarking – meaning there is no current target set, but measurements will continue.

C3.1 EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION
This measure sets out to learn from communications and continually improve over time. As a starting point, the measure only includes email open rate statistics, an indicator of subject matter relevance and marketing ability. Benchmarks and targets have yet to be set.

C3.2 RESPONSE TIMES
Facilities Services aims to decrease the amount of time customers spend waiting for acknowledgement of receipt. Response time goals vary by team and urgency, but a target of meeting 90% of those unit level goals was set. This quarter 83% of work orders met their response time goals, the most since the measure launch.

C3.3 DEADLINES MET
Deadlines Met compares the target and actual completion times of work orders in maintenance shops. The percent of work orders completed on or before set deadlines increased to 90.1% for Q4, surpassing the 90% target for the first time.

C3.4 LOCATION BASED FEEDBACK
Happy-or-Not kiosks record customer satisfaction data at the point of interaction. A target of 80% positive feedback has been set for all results, independent of question asked. Q4 received a larger amount of customer feedback due to movement of polling locations and additional machines – satisfaction decreased slightly from 72% to 71%.
C3.5 COMPLETION OF SERVICE SURVEY
This measure sets out to improve customer interactions by tying surveys to individual transactions, allowing for a quicker response to customer needs. The measure is still in the process of finding benchmark and target, Q4's satisfaction rate was 87.6%, 9 points less than Q3.

FINANCIAL STEWARSHIP
F1.1 RECHARGE CENTER WORKING CAPITAL
Working capital in excess of 60 days' worth may indicate customers are being charged too much for services and is the maximum allowable by UW standards. FS has set a target of less than 10 days working capital to as closely align revenue with overhead as possible. Facilities construction came in at -18 days, indicating revenue loss, while Motor Pool was within the target at 10 days.

F1.2 DIRECT LABOR TO JOB AVAILABILITY
By comparing labor hours applied directly to work orders with the total labor hours on site, FS intends to lower the charge rate to customers and increase productivity. Of the three units measured, Campus Operations exceeded the target by 6%, Maintenance and Construction both came close at 1% below target.

F1.3 AIM WORK ORDER ACTUAL VS ESTIMATE
To reduce customer dissatisfaction and misallocation of resources, Facilities has set a goal to improve work order estimates quoted to customers. In Q4 FY2017, 39% of work orders were within the 10% variance, a slight dip from the previous quarter. The target was not met.

F1.4 STEAM COST
Facilities Services considers it a success if we can produce steam more efficiently than the local Seattle producer (Enwave). In 2014 Enwave average cost per 1000lbs of steam was $14.78, this last quarter the cost of steam production for UW was $12.97 per 1000lbs – which was higher than the previous 7 quarters, but still within the target.

F1.5 RESOURCE CONSERVATION ROI
The Resource Conservation ROI, a measure of the financial soundness of completed energy-conservation projects, exceeded the target of "cost effective" and reported an ROI of $10.51 for every $1 invested. This Q4 closes the FY15-17 biennium, a cumulative ROI of $7.42 was achieved.

BUILD CAPACITY
L1.1 EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT & GROWTH
FS has started tracking (this quarter) the number of available positions filled by internal candidates through promotion or transfers. This measures retention, growth, and engagement of employees and reinforces a commitment to invest in current employees.

L2.1 FS-WIDE INCIDENT RATE
Facilities Services aims to continually reduce the injury incident rate for all employees with a goal of becoming better every year (i.e.: to beat the previous record). For Q2 CY2017 there were 15 recordable incidents (a rate of 1.6 per 100 employees) with a target of 2.0 – the target was met.

L3.1 RECOGNIZING, RESPECTING, & LISTENING
Employee recognition drives engagement, increases retention, and promotes good leadership. While not every recognition event can be easily recorded, employees that are recognized by team or by name through monthly Lean Huddle surveys have been listed in place of a quantitative measure on slide L3.1.

EMBRACE INNOVATION
P1.1 LEAN PARTICIPATION
As part of the FS Management System, employees are encouraged to participate in continual improvement (daily kaizen). We measure this participation through a monthly survey that goes out to each team and compare that to the number of FTE's. This quarter we achieved a record 58.8% participation, which remains outside the target of 80%.
P1.2 IDEA IMPLEMENTATION

The measure of Idea Implementation, an indication of Lean culture, did not meet its target of 2 ideas per person per month. For the third quarter in a row, ideas implemented per person remained below 0.8. This is likely due to lingering effects of organizational change and the addition of new teams adjusting to lean systems.

P2.1 WATER CONSERVATION

Water Conservation, which aims to reduce water usage across campus, missed its targeted reduction goal. Water usage decreased 2.4% from previous quarter to 1,130,000 gallons per day (rolling 12-mo avg) – which is 10% higher than the target.

P2.2 ENERGY CONSERVATION

Energy Conservation, another measure assessing campus sustainability, did not meet its target reduction of 13% from the 2008 baseline year. Energy use intensity decreased 0.7% from previous quarter to 190 kBtu/ft2/year - only 4.3% below the 2008 baseline, but shows that efforts being made still have positive impact.

P2.3 CARBON FOOTPRINT REDUCTION

This quarter the carbon footprint measures (scopes 1-3) have been merged to form a single measure of overall carbon footprint reduction. The 2016 target of 11% reduction from the 2005 baseline was just barely missed at 10.76% reduction. The challenge increased next year with a goal of 12% reduction.

P2.4 DIVERSION RATE

The major indicator of UW's recycling and composting efforts is the Diversion Rate measure. With a goal of 70% waste diverted from the landfill by 2020. This quarter FS diverted 62% of waste, which was not enough to meet the FY2017 quarterly target of 67%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>6/30/16</th>
<th>9/30/16</th>
<th>12/31/16</th>
<th>3/31/17</th>
<th>6/30/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the customer / stakeholder experience</td>
<td>C1.1 Preventive vs Corrective Maintenance</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>New Measure (Q1 FY2017)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1.2 FS Repair vs Campus Identified</td>
<td>Christine Lucier</td>
<td>New Measure (Q1 FY2017)</td>
<td>&gt;60%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>&gt;60%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>&gt;60%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1.3 Resilience Planning</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Measure in Planning / Development Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the customer / stakeholder experience</td>
<td>C2.1 Grounds Resource Utilization</td>
<td>Howard Nakase</td>
<td>New Measure (Q3 FY2017)</td>
<td>&gt;185</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>&gt;185</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2.2 Selected Public Spaces at APPA 1 or 2</td>
<td>Victor Cardona</td>
<td>New Measure (Q1 FY2017)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the customer / stakeholder experience</td>
<td>C3.1 Expand reach - number of impressions</td>
<td>Ari Kasapyan</td>
<td>New Measure (Q3 FY2017)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3.2 Response times</td>
<td>Tyler Quandt</td>
<td>New Measure (Q1 FY2017)</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3.3 Deadlines Met</td>
<td>Rich Dierck</td>
<td>New Measure (Q1 FY2017)</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3.4 Location-based Feedback</td>
<td>Ari Kasapyan</td>
<td>New Measure (Q1 FY2017)</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3.5 Completion of Service Survey</td>
<td>Jennifer Connors</td>
<td>New Measure (Q2 FY2017)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build capacity</td>
<td>L1.1 Employee Engagement</td>
<td>Page Russell</td>
<td>Measure in Planning / Development Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L2.1 FS-wide incident rate</td>
<td>Tracey Mosier</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L3.1 Recognizing, Respecting, Listening</td>
<td>Page Russell</td>
<td>New Measure (Q1 FY2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Cost / Increase value</td>
<td>F1.1 Recharge Center Working Capital</td>
<td>Lori Natsume</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>10.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1.2 Direct Labor to Job Availability</td>
<td>Lori Natsume</td>
<td>=3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1.3 AIM Work Order Actual vs Estimate</td>
<td>Eric Dauplaise</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1.5 Resource Conservation Program: RCM RDI</td>
<td>Norm Menter</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embrace Innovation</td>
<td>P2.1 Water conservation</td>
<td>Joe Cook</td>
<td>&lt;1039</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>&gt;1028</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>&gt;1028</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>&gt;1028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2.2 Energy conservation</td>
<td>Joe Cook</td>
<td>&lt;176.7</td>
<td>185.7</td>
<td>&lt;172.7</td>
<td>189.4</td>
<td>&lt;172.7</td>
<td>189.3</td>
<td>&lt;172.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embrace Innovation</td>
<td>P2.3.1 Carbon Footprint Reduction</td>
<td>David Grodzik</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>&gt;12%</td>
<td>&gt;12%</td>
<td>&gt;12%</td>
<td>&gt;12%</td>
<td>&gt;12%</td>
<td>&gt;12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2.4 Waste diversion</td>
<td>Liz Gignilliat</td>
<td>&gt;65%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>&gt;67%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>&gt;67%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>&gt;67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage all staff in continuous improvement</td>
<td>P1.1 Lean Maturity (formerly Lean Participation)</td>
<td>Kevin Kramer</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1.2 Employee idea implementation</td>
<td>Kevin Kramer</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>&gt;2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** See individual and team recognitions on the presentation slide.
FACILITIES SERVICES ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Strategic Planning & Continuous Improvement
- Collaborated with UWPD, Emergency Management, and other campus partners to enhance Facilities Services support for campus events and emergency events.
- Created a QA position to directly support service recovery practices and auditing.
- Helped TS rebuild its Balanced Scorecard Strategy to be launched in Q1 FY2018.

Facilities Employee Services
- Created Gantt Charting, Workday, SharePoint, and OneDrive courses as well as TED Talk Tuesdays to further build capacity throughout FS.
- Added a popcorn machine, guest Wi-Fi, water bottle filler, and AED unit to the training center.
- Created Supervisor LOTO Field Evaluations training that will include in the field follow up with the supervisor-tool to assist supervisors to model safety awareness.
- Established shared services model between FS and Capital Projects.

Building Services Department
- Hosted visitors from University of Oregon and University of Taiwan to showcase campus waste innovations.
- Gene Woodard received the Husky Green Award from UW Sustainability.
- Recycling presented at the Washington State Recycling Association Conference and promoted recycling on campus for Earth Day.
- Recycling installed MiniMax program in 3 more locations, making the waste containers accessible and visible for all users.
- Collected 28.4 tons of reusable items to local charities and non-profit organizations during Husky Neighborhood Cleanup and SCRAM in collaboration with HFS and local nonprofits.

Campus Operations
- Elevator and HVAC employees completed Job Hazard Analysis, improving work safety.
- Developed Husky Ready plans, to mitigate loss in an emergency event.

Engineering Services
- ES Records unit (with CPD) updated the document transmittal process from a 5-page printed document to a shorter online form, reducing waste and improving the user experience.
- Streamlined the Public Records Request delivery process using SharePoint to improve response time, security, and efficiency.
Finance & Business Services

- Resource Conservation Program completed 13 projects in the 15-17 biennium. Projects completed avoid 3,975 metric tons of campus carbon emissions annually.
- UW Shuttles developed a staff scheduling tool and implemented an afternoon peak schedule for the Health Science Express to improve on time performance, efficiency, and accountability.
- Fleet Services was ranked #84 in the 2017 Top 100 Fleet Awards and was #4 among universities in the US.
- FS Stores delivery time was above the goal of 90%, revealing that all FS Stores logistics processes are functioning well from procurement to final delivery.
- FS Stores catalogued 60 antiquities in AiM, ranging from priceless wall fixtures to decorative doorplates, directly contributing to the historical preservation of the University.

Transportation Services

- TS Events launched new nomenclature system for Arranged Parking to eliminate confusion of guests and relieve gatehouse backups.
- TS reached its highest level of safety training compliance to date, and surpassed the FS goal with 99% compliance.
- TS held a Parking Project Launch in June to identify gaps in current systems and propose major changes that will prepare UW lots for the future.

Facilities Maintenance & Construction

- Shops 41, 15C and 15M (NE Zone) and the Building Envelope team (Outside Zone) created new dedicated Lean huddle room space to improve innovation and engagement.
- Completed $250K of LED re-lamps/retrofits that resulted in $140K in rebates and over $50K saved in annual energy savings.
- The Lockshop implemented new key tracking and CAAMS software to improve business practices.
- Grounds Operations began using a touch screen monitor for planning discussions (maps, plans, pictures, work orders, etc.).
- Equipment Operations re-organized Corp Yard 2, creating better circulation and access for all FS users.

UWEM

- Replaced and upgraded 65 computers, workstations and servers in the EOC and Data Center.
- Co-hosted the semi-annual Disaster Resilient University West Symposium in Portland, OR, with nearly 150 participants in attendance.
- Supported the USA 2017 Special Olympics Golf Tournament and “dry-run” events in anticipation of next year’s main event.
- Developed an enhanced “Planning Procedures for Large-Scale Special Events” and began a formal input process for stakeholder comments.
C1.1 PREVENTIVE VS CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE

OBJECTIVE: C1 DELIVER A CAMPUS READY FOR BUSINESS EACH DAY
QUADRANT: ENHANCE CUSTOMER / STAKEHOLDER EXPERIENCE

PM TO CM RATIO (ACTUAL WORK HOURS)

Measure Intent: To minimize unplanned outages and system failures. A 75:25 ratio of Preventive to Corrective Maintenance is considered APPA Level 2, Comprehensive Stewardship.

Measure Formula: Ratio (%) of actual work hours of planned vs corrective maintenance retrieved from AiM work orders.

Movement:
- Target Met? Yes
- Toward or Away: Toward
- Qtr Difference: 3% increase
- Year Difference: 1.5% increase

Reasoning:
Increase occurred in both CEO (18.8% to 22.3%) and FMC (16.2% to 19.5%)

Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:
- FS Goal for FY18 to reach 50% PM:CM ratio
- NE Zone piloting use of BAM! (Brick And Mortar) scheduling system for systems-based approach to Preventive Maintenance
- SW Zone piloting Building Based Maintenance (BBM) program
- Active recruitment for Preventive Maintenance Manager

Recommendations:
- Incorporate PM accomplishment into natural work group huddles to identify crew- and shop- based gaps and generate ideas
- Identify PM work accomplished by contract (i.e Elevator Maintenance) and capture this effort as part of our PM ratio
- Define methods to collect data for non - AiM units.

What can we expect in the future?
- This quarter showed the first significant movement towards the strategic goal. As the FMC pilot programs are more fully implemented and continuously improved, the trend should continue.
- Capturing non-shop PM work should assist in reaching Q1 goal as these pilot programs gain traction.

CHAMPION: DAMON FETTERS
OWNER: TBA

C1.2 REPAIR: FS VS CAMPUS IDENTIFIED

OBJECTIVE: C1 DELIVER A CAMPUS READY FOR BUSINESS EACH DAY
QUADRANT: ENHANCE CUSTOMER / STAKEHOLDER EXPERIENCE

PERCENTAGE OF FS STAFF IDENTIFIED ISSUES (WORK ORDERS)

Measure Intent: To create a culture of FS staff awareness of their surroundings and to identify and repair issues before the customers complain.

Measure Formula: Percentage of corrective work orders submitted by FS staff vs those submitted by customers through complaints, FS Works, or AiM.

Movement:
- Target Met? No
- Toward or Away: Away from target
- Qtr Difference: Moved 8 points away
- Year Difference: Moved 14 points away

Reasoning:
This quarter removed preventive maintenance work orders from the FS submitted total. The elimination of the PM work orders resulted in a larger gap from the target, but gave a more accurate measurement. It should also be noted that this measure is competing with the customer care team and FS website which were created to simplify the communication process with customers, providing easier access to FS’s services.

Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:
- Employee Training
- Improved website/submission features.
- Customer care team.

Recommendations: Continued staff education and awareness training. Customer Care teams have already met with groups of custodians in BSD and the hope is that they will meet with all custodians for an informative exchange of information.

What can we expect in the future?
The 60% target will remain a stretch. More data is needed to see whether there are seasonal fluctuations in the reporting of work orders. Increased accuracy with the way data is recorded may also impact future results.

CHAMPION: DAMON FETTERS
OWNER: CHRISTINE LUCIER
**C1.2 Repair: FS vs Campus Identified**

**Objective C1: Deliver a Campus Ready for Business Each Day**

**C1.2 Repair: FS vs Campus Identified**

**Commentary:**
This chart is a breakdown of work orders submitted by FS Departments for the last four quarters. SPCI’s addition of the Customer Care Team resulted in this department’s first appearance in the data. The added group submitted 44 more work orders for the department than the previous quarter, more than tripling their contributions.

FMC, formerly the largest submitter by volume, saw a large decrease in submissions in Q4.

It was also recently noted that previously students were counted as FS-Submitted in the data. It is possible that changes in Work Day will have an affect on the FS reported work orders going into the next year.

**Work Orders Submitted by Department (Year to date)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>FMC</th>
<th>CEO</th>
<th>BSD</th>
<th>FABS</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>AVP/SPCI</th>
<th>FES/EM</th>
<th>Sum of Non-FS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>2447</td>
<td>2187</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>3301</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>3011</td>
<td>2231</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>2049</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C1.3 Resilience Planning (Not Ready)**

**Objective C1: Deliver a Campus Ready for Business Each Day**

**Quadrant: Enhance Customer / Stakeholder Experience**

**Measure Not Yet Ready / Work in Progress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Due By</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previewed Continuity</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Presented continuity concepts and requirements at monthly FS Manager/Supervisor Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment/hiring for key vacancy delayed by Central HR mandate to conduct Class &amp; Comp Study. Lack of qualified candidates further delayed hiring process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Position</td>
<td>2/28/17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Position was vacated in Sept. 2-016 and EM office does not have a qualified substitute measure owner available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Position was vacated in Sept. 2-016 and EM office does not have a qualified substitute measure owner available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Resilience Planning</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Position was vacated in Sept. 2-016 and EM office does not have a qualified substitute measure owner available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign measure owner duties</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Position was vacated in Sept. 2-016 and EM office does not have a qualified substitute measure owner available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop measure, add sources</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Position was vacated in Sept. 2-016 and EM office does not have a qualified substitute measure owner available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Draft Measures to FS Directors</td>
<td>10/31/17</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Position was vacated in Sept. 2-016 and EM office does not have a qualified substitute measure owner available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete FS Baseline Measures</td>
<td>12/31/17</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Position was vacated in Sept. 2-016 and EM office does not have a qualified substitute measure owner available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure Intent:** Evaluate Facilities Services’ readiness to support daily business operations by promoting preparation for space, personnel and processes.

**Measure Formula:** Measure not yet defined

**Champion:** Steve Charvat

**Owner:** TBA

**Movement:**
- Target Met? N/A
- Toward or Away: N/A
- Qtr Difference: N/A
- Year Difference: N/A

**Reasoning:** Inadequate Staffing

**Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:**
- Hire resilience planner

**Recommendations:** N/A

**What can we expect in the future?** N/A
**LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE APPA SERVICE LEVEL EVALUATION**

**Measure Intent:** Evaluating the different maintenance service levels of landscape areas on campus will help identify and prioritize the areas to focus our resource efforts, as well as assert a level of accountability within our operations.

**Measure Formula:** 8 campus zones are evaluated based on APPA Maintenance Levels 2-5, with possible scores of 10, 10, 10, 9, and 4 respectively. Individual zone scores are aggregated for a total possible score (264).

**Movement:**
- **Target Met?** Yes
- **Toward or Away:** Beyond to the “Good”
- **Qtr Difference:** A 3% decline but still above the target goal
- **Year Difference:** Unknown

**Reasoning?**
Spring had its flush of plant growth activity later in the season than usual. Lack of natural precipitation in the month of June would attribute to the drop in evaluation scores. Evaluation totals for Summer and Fall quarters should help demonstrate the seasonal fluctuation for staffing needs, relative to plant growth and outdoor campus activities.

**Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:**
- Safety/security landscape renewals funded projects.
- Biosolid soil mix specs for current CPD projects (weed control).
- 3-year landscape maintenance service agreement integrated into project costs for the grow-in period (Population Health).
- Development of Arborist crew combining staff from Grounds and Arboretum units to expeditiously address tree maintenance issues.

**Recommendations:** Inclusion of construction project specifications for Biosolid waste products to be used in all soil mixes, eliminating foreign weed seeds from being imported in (Horsetail, Morning Glory). Moving forward, the maintenance intensive grow in period of newly constructed landscapes will be a project responsibility to help manage those operational staffing challenges.

**What can we expect in the future?**
As unfunded mandates by our city, county and state agencies, requiring water quality and storm management features be integrated into the landscaping of new projects, how do we strategically realign our static staffing efforts (levels)?

---

**C2.1 GROUNDS RESOURCE UTILIZATION**

**OBJECTIVE C2: PROVIDE QUALITY CAMPUS SPACES AND PLACES**

**QUADRANT: ENHANCE CUSTOMER / STAKEHOLDER EXPERIENCE**

**Map of Landscape Maintenance Zones**

**Monthly Landscape Maintenance Zone Service Level % of Possible**

**Individual Zone Service Level Evaluation Results**

**SqFt Maintained Per Hour**

**Strategic Alignment**
1. Reduce Maintenance Levels
2. Reduce Maintenance task/Frequency
3. Change Landscapes
4. Design Process improvements
5. Hire Additional Staff
Measure Intent: To increase and/or maintain cleaning levels by prioritizing and tracking high-profile/usage public spaces.

Measure Formula: The percent of selected building spaces at APPA rating 1 or 2. 81 selected buildings were based on traffic and profile, with selected hallways, classrooms, entryways, and restrooms.

Comments: Area D (MOLES, Physics-Astronomy, Meany, etc) had the highest percentage of spaces meeting desired APPA levels. The chart shows a trend of higher APPA percentage with less spaces per area... except for area G, which breaks the rule. Area G (Guggenheim, Lowe, Mary-Gates) typically has older buildings, which may impact APPA scores negatively.

The 5 APPA Levels Defined:
1 - Orderly Spotlessness (eat off the floor)
2 - Orderly Tidiness (fingerprints/low dust)
3 - Casual Inattention (looks good at distance)
4 - Moderate Dinginess (obvious dirt buildup)
5 - Unkempt Neglect (cobwebs abound)
C3.1 EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION
OBJECTIVE C3: BE EASY TO DO BUSINESS WITH
QUADRANT: ENHANCE CUSTOMER / STAKEHOLDER EXPERIENCE

**OPEN RATE OF EMAIL CAMPAIGNS (BY CY)**

- **Measure Intent:** To improve relationships, knowledge, conversation and ease of access to information with customer base.
- **Measure Formula:** Measures total number of FS impressions (a compilation of Web visits, Blog impressions, Facebook Likes, Email opens, Social Media impressions, Event contacts) against goals set by each unit.

**Movement:**
- **Target Met?** No target set (26% is a benchmark)
- **Toward or Away?** N/A
- **Qtr Difference:** 3 point improvement
- **Year Difference:** 10 point improvement from Q2 2016

**Reasoning?**
As we learn more about email campaign best practices we can adapt to understand best timing and formatting to more successfully reach our audience – be it internal or external to FS.

**Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:**
- N/A

**Recommendations:** Future iterations of this measure can include website visits, which may tell the story of how effective our communications are (directing users to a simple source of information).

**What can we expect in the future?**
As we continue to measure number of impressions we will gain a better understanding of our audience and create best practices around those lessons learned. In turn open rate (and possibly web visits) will increase over time.

---

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

**OBJECTIVE C3: BE EASY TO DO BUSINESS WITH**

**C3.1 EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION**

**Measure Intent:**
This metric gives greater insight into who FS Communication sends emails to, along with the average number we send each quarter and how many open (read) them.

**Key audience groups:**
- Parking permit holders
- U-PASS members
- Opt-in customers
- MRAM, Campus administrators
- Building coordinators
- BOR-Finance Audit and Facilities
- Key clients, Focus group attendees
- UW event planners list
- ICA, South Campus Transportation Committee
- Emergency Management list
- Neighborhood stakeholders (U Village, U District Chamber, etc)

**Not currently included:**
- Surplus internal customers
- Surplus external customers

**Above:**
This metric gives greater insight into who FS Communication sends emails to, along with the average number we send each quarter and how many open (read) them.

The FSAB emails (47) had tracking turned off and therefore had a 0% open rate.
CHAMPION: DAMON FETTERS
OWNER: TYLER QUANDT

C3.2 RESPONSE TIMES
OBJECTIVE C3: BE EASY TO DO BUSINESS WITH
QUADRANT: ENHANCE CUSTOMER / STAKEHOLDER EXPERIENCE

OVERALL PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE TIMES MET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Times

Target

Movement:
- Target Met? No
- Toward or Away: Toward
- Qtr Difference: 3.6 point improvement
- Year Difference: 0.6 point improvement

Reasoning:
This is the first full year of pulling real data for this new measure. We saw our biggest increase in percentage of response times met than any other quarter. The quality of timecards entries and the management of AIM Work Order's were the main factor in the percentage increase.

Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:
- Timecard notes on Work Order completion
- Establish QR Team (in progress)
- Implement daily huddles in FS Shops (in progress)

Recommendations:
- Review AIM to ensure duplicate work orders are not created
- Focus on data quality in our AIM work order system.
- Shop Supervisors/Leads to review response time reports with team to see if there are ways to improve.
- Focus on the Work order's priority level & ensure proper coding.
- Implement training to the shops not meeting the expectation to ensure our on-going measures are accurate

What can we expect in the future?
We saw our biggest increase in percentage of response times met than any other quarter. With the school starting up in the next two quarters, we expect a larger volume of work request coming in, which could result in a smaller increase towards our target than previous quarters.

Measure Intent: The intent is to measure Facilities Services overall effectiveness to communicate with our customers and to ensure our response times to our customer's needs are being met.

Measure Formula: Response times met divided by total response times. Times (goals) and priorities are set by individual units depending on the type of work.

Measure: The intent is to measure Facilities Services overall effectiveness to communicate with our customers and to ensure our response times to our customer’s needs are being met.

Supplementary Information:

C3.2 RESPONSE TIMES
OBJECTIVE C3: BE EASY TO DO BUSINESS WITH

FY2017 Q4 Response Time Breakdown by Unit & Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>FY2016 Q4</th>
<th>FY2017 Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total WO's</td>
<td>% pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEO</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 20 - FOMS</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 23 - Elevator</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 25 - UW Tower</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 69 - HVAC</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 24 - Fire Alarm</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 20 - FOMS</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 23 - Elevator</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 25 - UW Tower</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 69 - HVAC</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 24 - Fire Alarm</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>8,358</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:
Individual contributions from all groups roll up into the departments and ultimately influence the success of Facilities Services as a whole.

Left: Breakdown of all contributing units to the response time measure.
### C3.3 Deadlines Met

#### Objective C3: Be Easy to Do Business With

**Quadrant: Enhance Customer / Stakeholder Experience**

#### Measure Intent:
The intent is to measure Facilities Services overall effectiveness to communicate with our customers and to ensure our deadlines are being met.

#### Measure Formula:
Deadlines met divided by total work orders. Times (goals) and priorities are set by individual units depending on the type of work.

#### Overall Percentage of Deadlines Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4 FY2016</th>
<th>Q1 FY2016</th>
<th>Q2 FY2016</th>
<th>Q3 FY2016</th>
<th>Q4 FY2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Pass</td>
<td>% Pass</td>
<td>% Pass</td>
<td>% Pass</td>
<td>% Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2016 Deadlines Met Breakdown by Unit**
- **2017 Deadlines Met Breakdown by Unit**

#### Commentary:

- Individual contributions from all groups roll up into the departments and ultimately influence the success of Facilities Services as a whole.
- Left: Breakdown of all contributing units to the deadlines met measure.
- Shops that typically are under the 90% mark greatly improved percentages, and are approaching the 90% mark.

### FY2017 Deadlines Met Breakdown by Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shop</th>
<th>Total WO's</th>
<th>% Pass</th>
<th>Total WO's</th>
<th>% Pass</th>
<th>Total WO's</th>
<th>% Pass</th>
<th>Total WO's</th>
<th>% Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 20 - FOMS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 23 - Elevator</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 23 - Fire Alarm</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 25 - UW Tower</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 69 - HVAC</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMC</td>
<td>6,866</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>7,285</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>6,604</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 10 - Grounds</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 14 - Central Zone</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 15 - NE Zone</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 16 - SW Zone</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 17 - Health Science</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 18 - Grounds</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 34 - SW Lock</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 35 - Health Science</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 41 - NE Zone</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 53 - Construction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 54 - Construction</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 55 - Construction</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 56 - Construction</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 58 - Construction</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Grand Total:

- 2016: 8,331
- 2017: 8,174

#### Target Met?
- Yes

#### Toward or Away?
- Toward

#### Qtr Difference:
- 2.2 point improvement

#### Year Difference:
- 3.3 point improvement

#### Movement:
- Toward or Away: Toward
- Qtr Difference: 2.2 point improvement
- Year Difference: 3.3 point improvement

#### Reasoning?
The steady improvement in work completion processes and implementation of the "FS Front Porch" are improving completion timeframes of work orders. Also a byproduct of Workday, which required daily entries and approval of timesheets, has worked to improve the work completion of WO’s.

#### Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:
- Timecard notes on Work Order completion
- Establish QR Team (in progress)
- Implement daily huddles in FMC (in progress)

#### Recommendations:
- Review AIM to ensure duplicate work orders are not created
- Review work orders that did not meet deadlines to see if there are ways to improve
- Ensure coding for material purchases is correct
- Implement training to the shops not meeting the expectation to ensure our on-going measures are accurate

#### What can we expect in the future?
As we continue to record data and continue to see a consistency of the target being met, we will raise the target to ensure we are continuously meeting our customer’s expectations.
C3.4 LOCATION-BASED FEEDBACK

OBJECTIVE C3: BE EASY TO DO BUSINESS WITH

QUADRANT: ENHANCE CUSTOMER / STAKEHOLDER EXPERIENCE

PERCENT OF POSITIVE FEEDBACK (ALL KIOSKS)

Measure Intent: To gather customer satisfaction data at the point of interaction (service areas) with the intent of adjusting priorities based on feedback and volume.

Measure Formula: Percentage of customers rating service areas positively (positive ratings divided by total ratings, multiplied by 100). Secondary metrics by area available as supplementary information.

Movement:
- Target Met? No
- Toward or Away: Away
- Qtr Difference: 0.8 point decline
- Year Difference: 12.2 point improvement

Reasoning:
We are learning more about the potential of these kiosks and peoples’ willingness to use them. In addition to assessing changes in customer satisfaction at more permanent locations as was initially planned, we now understand that kiosks placed temporarily at events and even at project sites can help provide planners with valuable lessons to inform future projects.

Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:
- Additional placements for HON machines (shuttles)
- Customer Care Team supplemental feedback process established

Recommendations:
The data identify specific locations and times of day that pose challenges for meeting customer expectations. Investigation into what conditions and events may result in that challenge can reveal how and where to target additional efforts.

What can we expect in the future?
As more customers use the machines we can expect an increase in accuracy and follow-up submissions to the customer care team – which can then be made into actions, furthering improvements to location-based customer satisfaction.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Results for Smaller (event) Surveys

Above Left: event-based surveys that are typically only placed over a short period of time (hours) and typically represent meetings with customers or employees. Surplus store customers provided feedback on both service and staff professionalism and regarded both to be very satisfactory.

Above Right: A split graph of both garage (left side) and restroom (right side) cleanliness. Garages have more customer interaction and higher average satisfaction. Restroom cleanliness saw a double-digit improvement from the previous quarter.

Results for Ongoing (larger) Surveys

Users were asked to rate on a scale of 4:
- Please rate the cleanliness of this garage today.
- Please rate the cleanliness of this restroom today.

The scale used:

![Scale Image]
PERCENT SATISFACTION FOR ALL TRANSACTION-BASED SURVEYS

Movement:
- Target Met? Target not set
- Toward or Away: N/A
- Qtr Difference: 8.7 point decline, (86.6 current, 95.3 past qtr)
- Year Difference: N/A

Reasoning?
Q4 marked the final quarter of streamlining surveys and data collection processes. UCAR data, 88% of responses, experienced two major changes that may impact the data. Halfway through the quarter, the scale was adjusted from 1-5 to 1-4 and the order of the numbers was reversed. Lower satisfaction numbers are attributed to these changes and the “best fit” analysis for matching similar survey responses.

Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:
• N/A

Recommendations: Q1 of 2018 will mark the first fully streamlined data collection period. We are still figuring out our baseline, therefore it is recommended that customer satisfaction be moved to an operational dashboard monthly metric until we are able to analyze a full year and determine if this measure is a candidate for change.

What can we expect in the future?
Survey methodology for all surveys is now consistent thus resulting in reliable data moving forward.

Measure Intent: By tying customer satisfaction to transactions, FS can more quickly pivot and create actions that resolve issues, improve processes, and increase customer satisfaction.

Measure Formula: Percent of customer’s rating their recent service experience as positive or very positive. Surveys are held after the completion of service and are transaction-based.

Customer Participation by Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ucar</td>
<td>4571</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS Events</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>5166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question of “Did we meet your expectations?” was asked different ways across each of the above units.
UCAR asked “Please rate our service” with a 1-5 scale for April and May and changed to a 1-4 scale for June, which now aligns their answers with the majority of the FS surveys.

TS Events asked “Value of services delivered” with 4 answers – Very Satisfied – Very Dissatisfied

Maintenance, Custodial, Construction, Surplus, FS Fleet, Moving Services and Recycling asked “Thinking about your overall experience with the service you received, how would you rate your satisfaction?” and had 4 answers – Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied and Very Dissatisfied.

Customer Participation by question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding my needs</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Service</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Time Frame</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous Staff</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to Detail</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Time Frame</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective F1: Deliver Cost-Effective Services**

**Quadrant: Reduce Cost / Increase Value**

### Recharge Center - Days of Working Capital

**Movement:**
- **Target Met?** Construction = No, Motor Pool = Yes
- **Toward or Away:** FC moved away from target, FC remained in target.
- **Qtr Difference:** 3 days further away from target for FC, MP still within target.
- **Year Difference:** 13 days further away for FC, 3 for MP

**Reasoning:**
Days of working capital for Construction was from -15 to -18. The further loss was due to number of skilled trades worked from April - June was reduced from restructure.

**Recommendations:**
- Utilization of visual management to schedule shop activities.
- Continued monitoring of labor hours
- Daily review of hours for productivity (dashboarding)

**Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:**
- FC Organizational restructuring
- Implement customer outreach to improve estimates submitted to approval conversion rate.

**What can we expect in the future?**
- Expect that Facilities Construction will trend toward positive in the near future.

---

**Measure Intent:** A working capital of more than 60 days may indicate overcharging of customers and is the maximum allowable by UW. FS has set a goal of 10 days to as closely align revenue with overhead as possible.

**Measure Formula:** Days of Working Capital = Budget Balance/Daily Expenditure

---

**Supplementary Information**

**Objective F1: Deliver Cost-Effective Services**

**F1.1 Recharge Center Working Capital**

**Commentary:**
Fleet Services had a positive balance as of $142k as of June 30th, 2017 which equates to positive 10 days working capital.

Construction had a negative balance of $409k as of June 30th, 2017 which equates to negative 18 days working capital.
**Objective F1: Deliver Cost-Effective Services**

**Quadrant: Reduce Cost / Increase Value**

### F1.2 Direct Labor to Job Availability

**Measure Intent:** To deliver cost-effective services to clients. Higher direct labor to job availability could result in a lower charge rate.

**Measure Formula:** Direct labor to job availability % (excluding Supervisors) = hours applied directly to work orders/total hours on site/100

**Movement:**
- **Target Met:** 1/3 of units met target. CO = Yes, FM = No, FC = No
- **Toward or Away:** CO remained above target, FM and FC trended toward.
- **Qtr Difference:** No change in target met/not met.
- **Year Difference:** FM was above target, is now below. No change to CO and FC.

**Reasoning:** Facilities Construction has more estimating/planning and communication with clients, thus the direct labor to Job productivity level is lower. Facilities Maintenance and Campus Operations have less planning and estimating as 80% of labor are contributed to absorbed work orders. Some lost productivity is contributed to HLD and less-productive roles (IE journey level into lead)

**Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:**
- Facilities Construction reorganization

**Recommendations:**
- Continue emphasis on the building-based maintenance model (major) and the Preventive Maintenance model.

**What can we expect in the future?**
- October – February were slow months and it is expected that the productivity would be low. The targets for FY18 are 79% and 87% for Construction and Maintenance respectively.

---

**Supplementary Information**

**Work Hours for Campus Operations**

- Hours Available: 20, 22, 24, 23
- Productive Hours: 19, 19, 19, 19

**Work Hours for Facilities Maintenance**

- Hours Available: 63, 62, 66, 65, 68, 71
- Productive Hours: 62, 57, 54, 56, 60

**Work Hours for Facilities Construction**

- Hours Available: 23, 22, 25, 19, 20, 20
- Productive Hours: 22, 22, 25, 19, 20, 20

Above (all 3): Displaying actual work hours for the three measured units. Maintenance (center) has more work hours than Operations and Construction combined. Operations remains the most efficient and consistent. Maintenance is consistent with little gains shown over time and Construction is slowly closing the gap.
2. Finding savings as work progresses

1. Job site efficiency

Estimate. Primary reasons attributed:

8.1 points toward
4.1 points away

We continue to see trends of construction below the estimate.

For Q4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Target Met?</th>
<th>Toward or Away</th>
<th>Qtr Difference</th>
<th>Year Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Away</td>
<td>4.1 points away</td>
<td>8.1 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasoning: The variance of -10/+10% with a 90% confidence is considered to be acceptable. The discrepancies between estimated and completed have several reasons: Primarily – work orders not being updates and contingencies not being needed.

Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:

- Identify resources to update work orders prior to entering “closed” status
- Work order review and client outreach
- Analyze WO’s that were closed over budget by more that 10% - customer communication/awareness.

Recommendations:

- Edit work orders to reflect cost changes throughout the course of the project.
- Review and determine protocol to determine and account for contingencies in a way that does not reflect in AiM estimate.

What can we expect in the future?

- Continued increase toward the goal of 50% as procedures and protocol for work order accuracies are improved.
**F1.4 STEAM COST**

**OBJECTIVE F1: DELIVER COST-EFFECTIVE SERVICES**

**QUADRANT: REDUCE COST / INCREASE VALUE**

**AVERAGE STEAM COST PER 1000LBS**

- **Measure Intent:** To reduce the cost of steam production through continuous improvement efforts.
- **Measure Formula:** $/1000 lbs = Total operating and Capital cost/Total Steam Produced/1000

**Movement:**
- **Target Met?** No
- **Toward or Away:** Away
- **Qtr Difference:** $3.33 more expensive
- **Year Difference:** $2.30 more expensive

**Reasoning:**

The average steam production was 88,231 units (1000 lbs per unit) which was a decrease of 37% compared with last quarter, thus the increased steam cost.

In addition to the fuel price reduction, minimized number of boilers running. Additionally comp-time was paid out and increased the staffing costs during this quarter. The higher steam cost in the summer months was due to a low demand in steam with same level of staffing cost.

**Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:**
- None

**Recommendations:**
- Benchmarking the fuel cost of steam generation, in dollars per 1,000 pounds ($/1,000 lbs) of steam, is an effective way to assess the efficiency of the steam system.
- Also taking advantage of the lower fuel price to co-generate more electricity would save on overall energy cost.

**What can we expect in the future?**
- Expect the steam cost to be lower than the national average. When the fuel price goes down, the steam cost will go down as well.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>$0.43</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
<td>$0.37</td>
<td>$0.43</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>$0.23</td>
<td>$0.16</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>$0.27</td>
<td>$0.29</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>$0.24</td>
<td>$0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.03</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$0.49</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>$0.40</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$1.44</td>
<td>$0.40</td>
<td>$0.40</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
<td>$1.12</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>$0.29</td>
<td>$0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.70</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>$2.08</td>
<td>$4.05</td>
<td>$0.42</td>
<td>$1.06</td>
<td>$3.39</td>
<td>$2.08</td>
<td>$0.98</td>
<td>$1.72</td>
<td>$1.99</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$1.28</td>
<td>$1.28</td>
<td>$2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.77</td>
<td>$1.86</td>
<td>$1.97</td>
<td>$3.01</td>
<td>$4.66</td>
<td>$2.68</td>
<td>$1.91</td>
<td>$5.17</td>
<td>$4.30</td>
<td>$2.14</td>
<td>$2.27</td>
<td>$2.92</td>
<td>$3.45</td>
<td>$2.73</td>
<td>$2.31</td>
<td>$5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7.96</td>
<td>$7.55</td>
<td>$8.48</td>
<td>$7.96</td>
<td>$7.79</td>
<td>$8.26</td>
<td>$7.89</td>
<td>$7.95</td>
<td>$5.54</td>
<td>$5.30</td>
<td>$4.84</td>
<td>$5.40</td>
<td>$5.53</td>
<td>$5.51</td>
<td>$5.61</td>
<td>$5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16.01</td>
<td>$11.23</td>
<td>$11.97</td>
<td>$13.85</td>
<td>$18.61</td>
<td>$11.49</td>
<td>$11.64</td>
<td>$15.34</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$9.22</td>
<td>$9.89</td>
<td>$10.67</td>
<td>$11.28</td>
<td>$10.78</td>
<td>$9.64</td>
<td>$12.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Steam Production (1000lbs)**

- **Steam Production**
  - 191552
  - 396988
  - 371242
  - 239529
  - 173552
  - 321440
  - 328512
  - 264376
  - 193840
  - 401759
  - 373488
  - 288888
  - 237378
  - 349296
  - 420031
  - 264694

**Commentary:** Steam production is much lower during the warm summer months than during the winter months. Subsequently the “cost” of payroll, operations and water/sewer is a much larger component of the steam cost than during the winter months. (below chart)
### Resource Conservation Return on Investment

**Measure Intent:** Insure completed RCMs are cost effective by targeting more cost effective projects and making sure lifetime utility cost avoided is greater than the net capital investment.

**Measure Formula:**

\[
\text{ROI} = \frac{\text{LUCA}}{\text{NCI}}
\]

where:
- **LUCA** = Lifetime Utility Cost Avoided
- **NCI** = Net Capital Investment

**Example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROI</td>
<td>Target ROI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$10.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Champion:** Jim Angelosante  
**Owner:** Norm Menter

### Completed Resource Conservation Measure - Return on Investment Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Conservation Projects</th>
<th>FY 16.1</th>
<th>FY 16.2</th>
<th>FY 16.3</th>
<th>FY 16.4</th>
<th>FY 17.1</th>
<th>FY 17.2</th>
<th>FY 17.3</th>
<th>FY 17.4</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Cost Avoided - Annual</strong></td>
<td>$256,945</td>
<td>$267,358</td>
<td>$272,860</td>
<td>$277,572</td>
<td>$282,480</td>
<td>$287,592</td>
<td>$292,804</td>
<td>$298,116</td>
<td>$2,073,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Investment</strong></td>
<td>$1,074,580</td>
<td>$1,080,690</td>
<td>$1,086,700</td>
<td>$1,092,810</td>
<td>$1,098,920</td>
<td>$1,105,030</td>
<td>$1,111,140</td>
<td>$1,117,250</td>
<td>$7,517,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rebates/Grants</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$42,988</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$139,258</td>
<td>$75,823</td>
<td>$49,903</td>
<td>$594,805</td>
<td>$902,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Capital Investment</strong></td>
<td>$1,074,580</td>
<td>$1,080,690</td>
<td>$1,086,700</td>
<td>$1,092,810</td>
<td>$1,098,920</td>
<td>$1,105,030</td>
<td>$1,111,140</td>
<td>$1,117,250</td>
<td>$7,517,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment</strong></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

- The table above provides the relevant details that inform calculation of the measure.
- Cumulative Statistics for FY 15-17 shown above illustrate the compounded impact of the program on key FS performance indicators: operational efficiency and cost effective services. FY15-17 projects avoid 3,975 MgCO2e annually. This represents 3.5% of 2005 UW baseline emissions avoided each year.
- Program “all time” statistics since program inception, FY15 Q1:
  - $4.4M gross/$1.8M net capital investment in 25 completed projects
  - $2.6M in rebates and grants secured
  - $6.6M in utility cost avoided over the life of the improvements
  - 5,803 MgCO2e avoided annually (5.1% of 2005 UW baseline emissions)
  - Net ROI: $3.64 saved for $1 net investment.

- The two projects completed in FY17 Q4 are noteworthy for a number of reasons:
  - These are the largest and most complex projects completed by the Resource Conservation Program (RCP) to date, involving state of the art HVAC control improvements to two large energy intensive facilities.
  - Both projects use a combination of FMC shops labor and specialty vendor labor to optimize project scheduling, leverage self-sustaining funds as a hedge against further reduction of public sector funding.
  - These projects captured more than $500,000 in utility rebates; the largest rebates of all projects completed this biennium! Utility reserves captured are re-invested in future projects, leveraging self-sustaining funds as a hedge against further reduction state allocations.

**Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:**

- FMC LED Lighting Team is scoping FY17-19 projects
- RCP/MC rolling out 17-19 Project Lists partnering with CEO/FMC for execution.

**Recommendations:**

- Expand conservation program processes to minor capital, building based maintenance and preventative maintenance programs.
- Thorough building audits and comprehensive planning provide necessary data for “optimized business case” decision making that combined with cost effective and timely work execution lead to reductions in deferred maintenance backlog, O&M efficiencies, higher customer satisfaction and longer facility life.

**What can we expect in the future?**

- 17-19 projects are prioritized based on ROI and carbon avoidance.
- 100 funded projects are estimated to return $8.22 per $1 invested. While individual project ROI’s will vary the cumulative ROI of projects completed is forecast to continue rise at an average rate of $0.25 per quarter over the next biennium.
Positions filled with internal candidates

Measure Intent: To improve employee engagement, job satisfaction, and retention through improved training and development.

Measure Formula: The percentage of eligible positions filled with an internal candidate during that quarter.

List of Promotable Positions

Accountant Senior  
Assistant Director  
Associate Director  
Budget/Fiscal Analyst Lead  
Control Tech Lead  
Control Technician Lead  
Computer Support Tech  
Custodian Lead  
Custodian Supervisor  
Director  
Electrician Lead  
Electrician Lead - High Voltage  
Electrician Lead-High Voltage  
Elevator Mechanic Lead  
Fiscal Specialist  
Fiscal Technician  
FOMS  
Gardener Lead  
Grounds Supervisor  
Industrial Hygienist  
Insulation Worker Lead  
Locksmith Lead  
Machinery Mechanic Lead  
Maintenance Mechanic  
Maintenance Mechanic Lead  
Maintenance Supervisor  
Manager  
Manager of Program Ops  
Media Maintenance Tech  
Motor Equipment Mechanic Lead  
Office Support Supervisor  
Parking Supervisor  
Plumber/Pipe/Steamfitter Lead  
Power Plant Ops Engineer  
Power Plant Ops Engineer Lead  
Program Supt.  
Refrigeration Mechanic Lead  
Senior Computer Specialist  
Sheet Metal Mechanic Lead  
Truck Driver  
Truck Driver Lead  
Window Washer Lead

Why Look at Retirement Eligibility?

By forecasting potential retirements from the pool of promotion eligible positions on the left, we can start to get a clear understanding of the opportunity we have in the years ahead to train and develop current individuals and get them ready to take over these roles. In doing so, we craft a stronger organizational bench, with individuals ready and capable to fill higher level roles. This can lead to more effective transitions in key professional and leadership positions, reducing the friction associated with hand offs of this sort. Over time, we become more intentional and less reactive about our succession planning.

Why Look at Retirement Eligibility?

Upcoming Retirement Eligibility of Promotable Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where does this data come from?

Clayton Brainerd (FES) collects this data when an open position is filled, whether by a new employee, transfer, fixed duration appointment, temp, or promotion. We have data going back as far as 2010.
**OBJECTIVE L2: EMBRACE A SAFE AND INJURY-FREE WORKPLACE**

**QUADRANT: BUILD CAPACITY**

**INCIDENT RATES BY QUARTER CY2012-2017**

**Measure Intent:** Incident rate is the best proxy indicator for safety, and can reflect if our safety improvement efforts are successful.

**Measure Formula:** Incident rate = the number of recordable incidents / hours worked YTD by all FTE / actual hours worked by all FTE. * Q1=50,000, Q2= 100,000, Q3=150,000, Q4= 200,000.

**Movement:**
- **Target Met?** Yes
- **Toward or Away:** Within the Target
- **Qtr Difference:** 20% improvement
- **Year Difference:** 24% improvement from Q2 2016

**Reasoning:**
There were 15 recordable cases in FS in Q2 2017. This is equal to the lowest number ever achieved in Q2. Three (3) departments met their target for the quarter, two (2) did not meet their departmental targets, one department is new and has no comparative data, and two departments (2) are continuing at an incident rate of zero (0). The cumulative incident rate for 2016 is 2.0.

**Recommendations:**
- Reinforce the use of safe work practices, Hazard Review Checklists, field checks and verify work plans and permits being completed and followed.
- Proper and consistent use of PPE.
- OARS reports should be reviewed and lessons learned implemented within each department, and FS wide when applicable.
- Monthly Accident reports should be reviewed by senior leaders to understand root causes and assist in implementing changes.

**Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:**
- Supervisor specific safety training – LOTO, Forklift
- Compliance with required training.
- Accident Reports Reviewed by senior leaders, monthly.

**What can we expect in the future?**
- FS has reduced the incident rate below the lowest quarterly average ever met. This is achievable again for Q3.

**STEPS DATA for WA State 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Incident Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All industries</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy &amp; CE construction</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty trade contractors</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger transportation</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing and storage</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair and maintenance</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY2017 Q2 Departments Compared**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Year to date rate</th>
<th>Cumulative target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FMC</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSD</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FABS</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2 Incident Rates 2012 - 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Incident Rate</th>
<th>Target Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary:**
- **Upper Left:** Chart displays cumulative yearly incident rates. Targets are based on best previous year of all recorded years.
- **Lower Left:** Chart displays cumulative incident rates for CY2017 separated by department. Targets are based on departments previous best year incident rates.
- **Upper Right:** Table of incident rates by department for the most recent quarter. Red indicates missing the target. Targets are based on the quarterly average of the previous best calendar year’s incident rates.
- **Lower Right:** Industry data for reference. Industry rates are for entire calendar years.
Mario F. (BSD) received an email from a customer in the Dept. of Radiology stating he has worked efficiently and the area is always clean, trash and floors.

Lemlem (BSD) kudo’s from client for consistently good work.

Bob Jones (BSD) came up with safety slogans and ideas for the art work. He has shown his commitment to the huddle and understands what the team is aiming for when it comes to safety.

The Bagley Team (BSD) is taking care of their building despite labor shortage and no complaints which is commendable under the circumstances.

Allen (BSD – Carpet Cleaning) for staying focused on task and special request.

Aaron Brantley (BSD) for reading and updating the status of the idea cards.

Custodial Tower Team thanks the CEO - UW Tower team for all they do to help them come up with solutions to building related issues.

Wilford C. (BSD Foster School Team) for thinking about ergonomics when cleaning glass railings.

Francis Garcia (BSD Johnson Hall) was recognized for helping prepare the bathrooms for deep cleaning by the MCI crew, their job went faster and easier because of his work.

Francis Garcia and Weini Ghebrey for keeping up with their huddle once Ed was gone as well as taking on the extra work entailed with keeping a still very busy building together due to open run coverage.

BSD - Physics Astronomy celebrated their safety goal of no accidents or near misses by having a potluck.

George Ceratto (BSD) was recently recognized by a customer for his dedication and conscientious work.

Thongnue Fossaeng (BSD Project Crew) and Leilani Uehara received great appreciation from Benson Hall, they really appreciated their efforts.

UW Recycling, the Northeast Maintenance Zone and Grounds were recognized for their quick response to a short notice situation.

CEO - Elevator Shop recognized Eric Hawley for his communication with a customer.

John Coronado (CEO - Record and Drafting) was recognized for his innovative idea to using ceiling-mounted track lighting for the board. The new lighting worked great.

FABS - A/P Team recognized Ren Gallier for processing 1079 invoices for the month of May 2017.

FES recognized Clayton Brainerd for his ongoing work on the large scale public records request and Katie Savoie / FS Payroll team for their work on preparing FS for the implementation of Workday.
Movement:
- Target Met? No
- Toward or Away: Toward the target
- Qtr Difference: 6.7 point improvement
- Year Difference: 12.4 point improvement

Reasoning:
FMC added nearly 50 employees to various teams over the last two quarters, which caused a large bump in participation. Several teams have yet still to report as they get up and running.

Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:
- Leader standard work

Recommendations:
Continue launching teams and have leadership encourage daily huddles through leader standard work. Work with ‘The Lean Team’ to build a process around measuring team maturity.

What can we expect in the future?
As more teams are added the participation rate should continue to rise. The measure will at some point move to a qualitative measure of team success (“Team Maturity”) where teams will be regularly assessed on the Four Key Systems.
P1.1 IDEA IMPLEMENTATION
OBJECTIVE P1: ENGAGE ALL EMPLOYEES IN CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT
QUADRANT: EMBRACE INNOVATION

NUMBER OF IDEAS IMPLEMENTED PER HUDDLE PARTICIPANT

Movement:
• Target Met? No
• Toward or Away: Toward the target
• Qtr Difference: 6.8% improvement
• Year Difference: -33% decline

Reasoning:
FS is still recovering from the reorganization that occurred in Q2 FY2017 which disrupted some high idea producing teams. Ideas implemented per person is seeing a slow return upward but remains quite a distance from the 2 ideas per person, per month. Individuals are being added that may still require time before embracing the culture.

Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:
• Leader standard work
• Leadership development intensives (LDI's)

Recommendations:
• Continue launching teams and have leadership encourage daily huddles through leader standard work.
• Work with ‘The Lean Team’ to build a process around measuring team maturity and create actions that build engagement.
• Break up larger teams (8+ people) to allow everyone to contribute.
• Increase frequency of huddles for teams not meeting more than once a week.

What can we expect in the future?
As more teams are added the participation rate should continue to rise. The measure will at some point move to a qualitative measure of team success ("Team Maturity") where teams will be regularly assessed on the Four Key Systems.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

- Left: The 12-mo rolling average of ideas implemented per huddle participant, broken out by department. SPCI remains the most efficient producer, even after a large slip from previous quarters. UWEM hits the target for the first time in two years.
- Below: Comparing performance by month. No significant conclusions can be made when comparing year-over-year except that Q1 months have typically outperformed themselves each year.

Measure Intent: The rate of implementation of employee ideas is an indicator of employee engagement and of a management system that values and encourages employee engagement.

Measure Formula: Total ideas implemented divided by the number of huddle participants (and FTE's). Huddle participants are as documented in each idea count survey.

Ideas Per Huddle Participant by Department

Year-Over-Year Comparison by Month
Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:
- New CCW pipe installed toward Life Sciences Bldg, April 2017
- Drumheller Fountain biennial cleaning in May 2017
- H-Wing cooling tower tube bundle leaking, needs replacement
- Tube bundle leak recently identified in Van De Graaff heat exchanger

Recommendations:
- Replace H-Wing cooling tower. Identify and replace old assets before failure to avoid waste. Implement measures found by Resource Conservation Team, including replacement of single-pass city-water cooled equipment and lowering humidity setpoints.

What can we expect in the future?
Short term, usage likely to increase this summer due to occupancy of new buildings and warmer-than-usual temperatures predicted by State Climatologist. Long term, completion and occupancy of new LSB, CSEII, Burke, Fluke, UWMC Exp Ph 2, North Campus Housing buildings will add to usage.

Rate hikes plus campus growth may drive up future water/sewer costs
- Meters for the new CCW system - SPU
- Total future monthly cost increase of $1,077,452

Central Campus Water/Sewer Cost, $ move up $12,711,452

Focus on energy, water and waste efficiency, including:
- Water conservation is one of the best indicators of our impact as a champion of environmental stewardship.
- Data from 7 main meters – excludes buildings served by SPU and re-used rainwater.

Change:
- Heat exchanger failure to avoid waste. Implement measures found by Resource Conservation Team, including replacement of single-pass city-water cooled equipment and lowering humidity setpoints.

• Target Net: No
• Toward or Away: Closer than previous qtr (toward)
• Qtr Difference: 2.4% improvement
• Year Difference: 1% decline (415M gal vs 411M gal)

Reasoning?
Recent increases due to largest-ever shutdown of CCW Central Cooling Water system to install new piping, Drumheller Fountain cleaning, failures of some water heater and cooling tower equipment, cooling tower cleanings, warm summertime temperatures, CPD construction activities, and occupancy of new capital projects. This period's lower usage may be due to cooler temps in Q4-FY2017 versus Q4-FY2016 and WCU water usage excluded from this central campus data but cooling of several buildings shifted from Central Plant to new WCUP.
Hike Rate increases and campus growth may push utility costs up $5.8M by FY2022.

For 12-months ending June 2017 versus year prior, Central Plant annual electricity rate increased 6.8% to $0.071/kWh while gas rate decreased 10.1% to $0.42/therm over previous year. SCL chiller usage down 20.7% to 18,379,080 ton-hours; steam usage 122,808 kWh; compressed air down 8.9% to 885,320 kCF.

Compared to previous period, electricity EUI down 0.8% and fuel EUI down 0.5%. Some fuel increase due to more turbine generator electricity. Some electricity decrease due to new efficient HFS dorms added to Central Plant electricity.

Buildings supplied directly by public utilities SCL (electricity) and PSE (natural gas). EUI (Site) includes energy consumed on the campus-level as metered by public utilities at Receiving Stations (electricity) and Central Plant (natural gas and fuel oil). Excludes on-site renewable energy usage.

For central campus only, energy costs of ~$27.2M during year:

- Electricity (excluding turbine) = $27,173,797.42
- Fuel (including turbine energy) = $33,010,166.11

For this measure, data includes buildings supplied by electricity from East and West Receiving Stations (~15.7M ft² incl parking garages) and UW Central Plant steam (~12.8M ft²), and excludes buildings supplied directly by public utilities SCL (electricity) and PSE (natural gas). EUI (Site) includes energy consumed on the campus-level as metered by public utilities at Receiving Stations (electricity) and Central Plant (natural gas and fuel oil). Excludes on-site renewable energy usage.

- UW Energy Dashboard: http://dashboard.mckinstry.com/uw/

**Reasoning?**

Many factors contribute. EUI rate improves when efficient buildings come online (Denny - Oct 2016, UWPD - June 2016) but gets offset when new energy-intensive buildings are occupied (ARCF - June 2017, Nano - July 2017). Several leaking heat exchangers have been, or will be, replaced. WCUP pipe replacement work sent some condensate to sewer while new chilled water piping installed.

**Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:**

- WCUP earns Envision Gold award from Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure
- CPD projects completed with efficiency measures (ARCF, Nano)
- Wallace Hall connected to WCUP in lieu of bldg chiller/cooling tower
- Leaking tube bundle identified in Van De Graaff heat exchanger

**Recommendations:**

Identify and replace old assets before failure to avoid waste such as IMA water heaters dumping condensate to drain. Proceed with ideas found by Resource Conservation Team, including variable frequency drive installs, Building Automation System upgrades, leaking steam valve replacements, controls adjustments such as temperature and static pressure resets; repairs to economizers, steam traps, insulation, etc.

**What can we expect in the future?**

Savings from energy conservation projects may be offset by new energy-intensive buildings Nano-Engineering, ARCF, UWMC Phase 2, Life Sciences Building.
**P2.3 Carbon Footprint Reduction**

**Objective P2: Champion Environmental Stewardship**

**Quadrant: Embrace Innovation**

**Percent MgCO₂e Reduction from 2005 Baseline Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MgCO₂e % Change</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure Intent:** To reduce UW’s carbon emissions by 15% by the year 2020 from the 2005 baseline year.

**Measure Formula:** Percent difference in annual metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent (MgCO₂e) emissions relative to baseline calendar year 2005 emissions.

**Comments:**

- Scope 1 includes “direct” emissions from UW equipment and facilities (natural gas heating, vehicle fleets, landfill). Scope 2 includes “energy import” emissions from non-UW facilities that generate the steam and electricity purchased by UW-owned facilities. Scope 3 emissions originate from sources no

**What can we expect in the future?**

The UW will not meet its carbon footprint reduction goal without implementing energy-saving initiatives or purchasing offsets. Developing and implementing energy-saving initiatives prior to 2020 will reduce or eliminate the need to purchase carbon credits. Note: A project has been started to update the UW “facility” baseline emissions estimate, and to account for changes to the GHG protocol which now includes regional electricity-related emissions.
**P2.4 DIVERSION RATE**

**OBJECTIVE P2: CHAMPION ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP**

**QUADRANT: EMBRACE INNOVATION**

### QUARTERLY DIVERSION RATE

- **Measure Intent:** Diversion rate is the key outcome indicator of success at promoting recycling and composting on the UW campus.
- **Measure Formula:** The percentage of campus waste that is being diverted from landfill, accumulated through fiscal year.

**Movement:**
- **Target Met?** No, the goal of 67% was not met.
- **Toward or Away?** Away
- **Qtr Difference:** 0.4 points decline
- **Year Difference:** 1.07 point improvement
  
  (62.53% FY16 to 64.6% FY17)

**Reasoning:**
Our recycling rates continue to go up while our landfill rates continue to go down due to our ongoing waste infrastructure improvements on campus and our education efforts.

**Current/Approved/Planned Initiatives:**
- Improved bulky material collection (FMC, corp yard)
- University waste characterization study in high generation areas
- Improved food waste collection from UWMC and HFS
- Increased implementation of the MiniMax waste program

**Recommendations:**
In order to stay on track to meet our goal of 70% waste diversion by 2020, we will invest in a waste characterization study to be more strategic in our diversion efforts. Continue collaboration with campus partners on targeted education programs, new buildings, and investment in infrastructural improvement and education.

**What can we expect in the future?**
Given the results of the Cedar Grove route audit we completed in FY2016 and the impact it had on our food waste weights, we do not anticipate being able to reach our fiscal year 2017 goal of 67% waste diversion.

---

**Waste Diversion Cost Avoidance**

**Diverting Waste Reduces Costs**

Every quarter we track the disposal cost savings of our diversion efforts. In Q4 we diverted 2,015 tons of material. If we sent that material to the landfill we would have spent over $292,000 on disposal costs. We spent over 185,000 on recycling this quarter, creating a cost avoidance of over $107,000.

Fluctuating net avoided disposal costs this quarter were driven by several things:
- Revised weight estimate lowered our food waste tonnage.
- Increase in disposal of materials with higher disposal rates, decrease in disposal of materials with lower disposal rates:
  - Metal earns $60/ton
  - Cardboard/Paper earns $45/ton
  - Commingled Recycling costs $0/ton
  - Resold/Reused/Donated costs $0/ton
  - Wood & Landscape waste costs $46/ton
  - Food waste costs $63/ton
  - C&D mixed waste costs $93/ton
  - Garbage costs $145/ton
  - Styrofoam waste costs $93/ton
  - Appliances cost $350/ton
  - Electronics cost $480/ton
  - Spent lighting cost $1,000/ton
  - eMedia costs $1,300/ton
UW's waste diversion story is still impressive despite not reaching our waste diversion goal!

First, the composition of our recycling and food waste streams is changing and the weight of those waste streams is a lot lighter than years past (thanks in large part to lighter recyclable and compostable food packaging).

Second, overall landfill waste generated per FTE on the UW Campus is on the decline while waste diversion per FTE is much higher.

At the end of FY2016 the average person at UW diverted 233 lbs of waste and only landfilled 142 lbs over the course of the year.

Because it will be harder and harder to achieve our overall waste diversion goal, tracking how much waste is generated per FTE will become more and more important and more accurate way to tell the UW's waste diversion story.

The MiniMax program increases waste awareness while increasing access to recycling and composting containers across campus. The more buildings converted to MiniMax waste infrastructure standards, the less material will go to the landfill.