**IPF Campus Key Performance Indicators**

- **Water Intensity Reduction**
  - FY15 goal 10%

- **Power Plant Efficiency**
  - 12 month avg. vs. stretch goal 68%
  - 82%
  - 91%
  - 51%

- **Better Buildings Challenge**
  - FY15 goal 10%

- **% Campus Renewable Energy FY15 goal 15%**

- **MMBTUs/electric MWH**
  - 12 month Avg. vs. EIA Benchmark 10.35

- **% GHG Reduction FY15 goal 30%**

**Campus Service Performance Trends**

- **Campus Use Intensity (kGal/GSF)**

- **Campus Renewable Energy Portfolio**
  - Calculated Renewable Energy Portfolio by Fiscal Year

- **MSU Reduction in GHG Emissions**
  - Calculated GHG Reduction by Fiscal Year
  - *Baseline FY 2009-10*

- **Source Energy Reduction (CY2014)**
  - Better Buildings Challenge

- **Electricity Usage for Area Served by T.B. Simon Power Plant**
  - *Baseline FY 2009-10*

**IPF Campus Key Performance Indicators**

- **Power plant efficiency at producing combined (steam) heat and (electrical) power also known as CHP** is shown as year over year performance.
- The heat rate graph shows how much input energy went into producing a unit of utility. They are often inversely proportional and are optimized when the non-CHP (combined heat and power) percentage is minimized.
- The plant electrical generation and utilization performance graph shows net generation of electrical utility and steam production. When the plant has a high percentage of steam relative to electrical production, it is expected to be more efficient and is indicated by the efficiency trend on the graph.
- Campus average EUI graph shows the specific utility consumption per square foot of building space. As campus grows, the demand will increase. Conservation measures and improvements to building methods to improve efficiency allow for a lower consumption of utilities per square foot.
### Infrastructure Planning & Facilities Service Metrics

#### Cost & Staffing vs. Peer Group Average

**PRELIMINARY DATA EXTRACTED FROM SIGHTLINES**

- Daily Service Act. $/GSF: $3.90 vs. $4.12, 94.7% of Peer Average
- Total PM $/GSF: $0.51 vs. $0.41, 124.4%
- Total Facilities Operating $/GSF: $5.48 vs. $6.41, 85.5%
- Total Spending $/GSF: $7.16 vs. $5.96, 120.1%
- Custodial Staffing $/GSF/FTE: 571.98 vs. 408.79, 141.5%
- Grounds Staffing Acre/FTE: 179.932 vs. 97.29, 151.4%
- Campus Inspection Index (Score): 69 vs. 79, 114.5%

Data points shown outside of the circle representing the peer average may be viewed as unfavorable to MSU.

Data from the chart is shown below.

#### Cost data is shown as a percentage of spending vs. peer.

Staffing and Campus inspection index is shown inversely, to normalize the chart.

---

### Capital Project Performance Data

- **Percentage of projects within budget, goal is 100%**
- **Customer Satisfaction, goal is 100% for all projects ***
- **Average change order rate, goal is 5% for each project **
- **Average percent contingency spent, goal is less than 5% for each project *

**PDC Metrics - Minor, PO and Self-Performed Capital Projects closed in FY 2014-15**

- Customer Satisfaction, goal is 100% for all projects ***
- Average change order rate, goal is 5% for each project **
- Average percent contingency spent, goal is less than 5% for each project *

* Total funds returned / Total Budgeted Contingency of all closed project
** Contractor Change Order Total / Total Budgeted of all 100 lines
*** Customer Satisfaction - survey program initiated in mid-2014; one project closed in FY2014-15