Agenda Board of Regents Emergency Meeting of the Facilities and Land Management Committee December 11, 2003; 3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

<u>Committee Members:</u> Elsa Froehlich Demeksa, Committee Chair Michael J. Burns

Michael Snowden Joseph E. Usibelli, Jr. The proposed BiCS–CAF project consists of a first floor housing animal quarters, veterinary space, necropsy and incinerator, as well as a teaching laboratory. The basement would have mechanical/electrical components, and space for additional animal quarters.

Construction estimates indicate that the \$14.25 million from the FY02 GO bond will not complete all UAF areas of the BiCS–CAF facility. The administration proposes deleting State Virology from current design efforts and proceeding with schematic design for approximately 42,000 square feet; approximately 50 percent of the space will remain unfinished until funding is secured. It is estimated that a

REFERENCE 1

HISTORY and BACKGROUND

In February 2003, the regents approved the UAF Biological and Computational Sciences Facility design project in the amount of \$1.5 million.

In April 2003, UAF presented Scenario A and Scenario B to the regents for consideration as two options for the design and construction of this project. Scenario A would have built a "plywood" shell of the entire 155,000 sf facility with existing funds while Scenario B would have initially built the finish quality exterior with glass on a 75,000 sf shell. The Board of Regents' Facilities and Land Management Committee directed the administration to proceed with Scenario B. Under Scenario B, each segment (research, teaching, animals, ARSC, and Virology) was to be completed as future funding allows either through build-out of a previously constructed shell or through additional construction. The committee also indicated its preference for a lower profile building that should be shifted to the East towards the Arctic Health Building, and analysis regarding demolishing the west wing section of the Arctic Health Building.

In June 2003, UAF briefed the regents on the status of the programming efforts for BiCS and discussed the option of construction a Central Animal Facility (CAF) as the first segment of the BiCS facility. The regents were generally in favor of the approach and advised UAF to proceed with the program development. The BiCS–CAF project would include the initial planning, but not design, for BiCS-Research at the original site west of Arctic Health.

On September 18, 2003 the Board of Regents approved the UAF Biological and Computational Sciences Facility Central Animal Facility (BiCS-CAF) Project and authorizes the University administration to proceed with the complete design and

buiepprovexal d in41,92sf ali funeet; 35%f a whi atwld be shunnish qed Tj 243.75 0 TD -0 Tc (

REFERENCE 2 – Facilities Anticipated Questions

BiCS Central Animal Facility (CAF) FAQs (Facilities Anticipated Questions)

The proposed Biological and Computational Sciences Facility (BiCS) included research animal quarters. What is the rationale for constructing a separate Central Animal Facility (CAF) for research animals?

Recent BiCS planning work to provide options for constructing the project in segments to accommodate incremental capital funding and planning to re-site the proposed facility identified a priority to accommodate research animals for current grants and new biological research investigators. Phasing the build-out of BiCS as it was currently programmed and the current available capital funds could not readily accommodate this priority. Also, replacing outmoded animal care and necropsy and incinerator facilities in the Arctic Health Research Building (AHRB) needs to be addressed in the next 1 to 3 years.

The BiCS facility design committee determined that a stand-alone animal care facility to support research activities in BiCS as well as other campus wide users should be constructed if:

- It could be built at a lower cost /SF than projected for the BiCS facility.
- It could be built using currently available BiCS funding (\$14.25 million). If initial funding is not adequate for full build-out of the facility, the scope of the initial build must include critical components to facilitate a significant improvement in current research animal holding capacity and capabilities at UAF and complete enough to attract viable grant funding for incremental build out.
- It could be located in close proximity to facilities that currently house research activities that utilize lab research animals.

What are some advantages to having a centralized animal facility versus an animal component in BiCS?

A centralized animal facility is a vast improvement over the animal component originally programmed in BiCS both functionally and operationally.

The facility design committee looked at the operational impacts of having the research animal housing separated from the research labs. They believe that centralization of research animal care on campus would provide opportunities to better manage appropriate animal care protocol and should reduce redundant investment in support equipment and



provide opportunities to maximize holding room utilization and staffing efficiencies. A separate animal care facility can also be designed to more readily expand to house additional animals at a lower construction cost, than adding space to the BiCS in the future.

d min the op)ritical e curs that uon antionourcesizatiuld bepohTsegned to

12-10-03

AHRB, Irving), does not accommodate relocation of incinerator/necropsy functions, does not provide proper containment zones due to the single corridor concept and is less suited to potential expansion plans.

Estimates based on the 42,000gsf schematic design indicate current available funds would allow completion of a portion of the animal holding suites and support spaces (see drawings). The initial construction will provide an operational facility that could be completed on an incremental basis.



Page 2

12-10-03

further expansion of the holding capacity due to the dual corridor configuration.

The current available project funds cannot complete any of the facility for immediate occupancy; the building would be a heated shell, ready for future improvements. The assigned space would be unfinished with build-out completed on an incremental basis. The cost increment for the first build-out would be substantial, to complete necessary HVAC infrastructure connections and architectural components. To complete the remaining areas would require an additional \$5.7 million (project cost), assuming the additional construction was completed by 2006.

Is the construction costs (\$/SF) lower for CAF than BICS?

The size and program complexity of the proposed BICS facility and its more prominent location on campus require a more "premium" priced

solution to building systems, public areas and finishes than a facility which will be dedicated to housing research animals and support staff. Since the CAF is not located in a prominent location, the buildings finishes and site amenities will be more modest without detracting from the appearance and functionality of the campus.

BICS CAF Facts

Current Available Project Funds: \$14.25 Million

Proposed Sche	dule:
Design:	September 2003 – April 2004
Bidding:	May 2004 (possible early site & foundation package)
Construction:	June 2004 – September 2005
Occupancy:	November 2005



BICS CAF Program Comparisons – using program square feet (PSF) of program space

Option 36			This	option not	considered viable	e for UAF prograi	ns		
Option B Square 42,000 GSF	20,552 PSF no public lobby	7,598 PSF (two corridors)	1,492 PSF (no large animals)	4,186 PSF	3,196 PSF	3,180 PSF replace AHRB facilities (RT-PCR only)	900 PSF (no microscope rm.)	0 PSF (locate in BICS)	\$17.9 M
Option C Rectangle 32,960 GSF	16,151 PSF no public lobby	8,820 PSF (one corridor)	1,492 PSF (no large animals)	3,586 PSF	1,653 PSF	No Necropsy Suite or Incinerator	600 PSF (no microscope rm.)	0 PSF (locate in BICS)	\$14.55 M
Initial Concept									
Existing AHRB	15,628	5,956 includes ST/AK Virology Lab	345	3,296 includes mech penthouse	3,789	1,662	580	0	•

Blue indicates program square footage (PSF) of program space that would be unfinished based on current available funding (\$14.25 M) Green indicates program square footage (PSF) of program space that would be partially finished based on current available funding (\$14.25 M)



REFERENCE 3 – Animal Care Facility Components

UAF Animal Care Facility Options & Current Situation Comparisons



UAF Animal Care Facility Options & Current Situation Comparisons (continued)

BiCS CAF Facility Components	Option B - 42,000 GSF \$17.9 M completed	Option C – 32,900 GSF <i>\$14.55 M completed</i>	Existing Situation (@ AHRB)
	4,186 GSF of Animal Support and		
Animal Support Cage / Rack Wash Supplies Laundry Receiving Quarantine Rooms			

REFERENCE 4 – Floor Plans



REFERENCE 5 – Capital Funding Options to Complete the Project

Funding Opportunities for Completion of Shell Space

Page 2

Foundations:

Murdock

- \$500,000 per year for major equipment or renovations that build research infrastructure
- requires a focused proposal from the university
- consider approaching foundation for a larger one time grant

Keck

Investigator Initiated Proposals:

- many allow opportunities for renovation and equipment
- animal per diem rates
- cannot fund new construction