New England Board of Higher Education
Both public and private campuses have 60% of space over 25 years old. Public campuses have a high percentage of space in 25-50; Private campuses have more space over 50 years old.

(%) Square Footage over 25 years old (Renovation Age)

- **Public**
  - 2007: 50%
  - 2008: 49%
  - 2009: 48%
  - 2010: 49%
  - 2011: 48%
  - 2012: 47%

- **Private**
  - 2007: 29%
  - 2008: 29%
  - 2009: 28%
  - 2010: 29%
  - 2011: 30%
  - 2012: 31%

Legend:
- **25 to 50 Years of Age**
- **Over 50 Years of Age**
#2 Capital funding peaked in 2008; has not returned to that level

Gap between public and private funding is greater than ever; annual funding growing

![Capital Investment into Existing Space](chart.png)
#3 More investment in envelope and building systems

Much less investment in safety/code projects

## Total Project Spending

### 2007
- Building Envelope: 30%
- Building Systems: 16%
- Infrastructure: 13%
- Space Renewal: 25%

### 2012
- Building Envelope: 30%
- Building Systems: 12%
- Infrastructure: 5%
- Space Renewal: 31%
#4 Public campuses have 20% greater backlog than private

Private campus backlogs growing at a much faster rate than public

![Graph showing the backlog $/GSF for public and private campuses over the years 2007 to 2012. The backlog for private campuses is significantly higher and growing at a faster rate than for public campuses.](chart.png)
#5 Public campuses spending more on daily facility operations

Possibly driven by lack of capital funding to address backlog of needs

![Bar chart showing daily service spending for public and private campuses from 2007 to 2012. The chart displays spending in dollars per square foot (GSF), with separate categories for Daily Service, Planned Maintenance, and Utilities. The spending trends indicate a higher average daily service cost for public campuses compared to private campuses.](chart.png)
Facilities operating budget profile

Public and private have seen a 14% and 12% reduction in utility costs, respectively.

Average Utility Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$2.55</td>
<td>$2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$2.80</td>
<td>$3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$2.91</td>
<td>$3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$2.65</td>
<td>$2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$2.70</td>
<td>$2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$2.49</td>
<td>$2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$/GSF
Conclusions

Age Profile of Campus

- Age profiles of New England campuses indicate that both public and private institutions face growing deferred maintenance needs and overdue life cycles.

Capital Expenditures

- Lack of capital funding growth since 2008 puts campuses further at risk of having building systems that will fail in the near future.

Backlog Growth

- Backlogs are growing and already reaching high risk levels at public institutions.
- Public campuses are already feeling the impact of high backlogs through increased operating expenses.

Positive Steps

- Positive steps include: More focus on durable investments; Increases in annual capital funding; Reductions in energy consumption and costs.
What can be done

Strategies that work

Risk Factors and Capital Planning

- Document age profile of campus, capital investment targets, backlog of deferred projects; operating cost drivers
- Segment buildings and capital needs into portfolios based on risk

Changing campus expectations and practices