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1. Foreword

The Physical Plant, in conjunction with several other campus partners such as Residential and Hospitality Services, Academic Technology Services, Recycling/Surplus/Waste Management, MSU Police, Land Management, Campus Planning and Administration, Facilities Planning and Space Management and MSU Purchasing, are partnering on an initiative called “The MSU Way – Excellence in Campus Operations and Services”. The MSU School of Planning, Design and Construction was requested to facilitate these efforts. Tariq Abdelhamid is serving as facilitator of the overall effort, working with the team of partners. The focus of the effort is on all operations and services that the Physical Plant and its sister units provide to campus clients. “The MSU Way” is the method of delivery all partners would agree to follow to consistently and collaboratively exceed our customers’ expectations while using MSU’s resources as efficiently as possible.

MSU historically provides a high level of service when delivering projects; projects are typically delivered on time, within budget and with a high level of quality. This can be seen in the performance metrics typically included in the annual construction and infrastructure report. While it is important to recognize this, it is also important and healthy for any organization to continue to look for ways to continuously improve at what they do. The MSU Way – ECOS is one of the ongoing initiatives contributing to this effort.

In the summer of 2009, representatives from the Physical Plant requested the SPDC conduct a focus group study to gain feedback from customer organizations. The focus group effort was initiated to help provide input for the MSU Way and to gain insight into the perception of the capital project delivery process. Tim Mrozowski, Professor of Construction Management in the SPDC led the focus group initiative, and tri-facilitated the groups with Chad Stirrett, Building Process Analyst, Campus Planning and Administration; and Karen Zelt, Communications Manager, Physical Plant. The initial effort was to focus on capital project delivery, and how the Physical Plant and its partners are viewed by campus customers.
2. Executive Summary

The intent of the focus group initiative was to understand customer perceptions of the capital project delivery process. Focus group participants were encouraged to identify areas where capital project partners excel as well as areas where they believed improvement was needed. While the primary intent was to get feedback on the capital project delivery process, participants also provided feedback on other areas of general service. The goal is to improve the experience of capital project customers and to strengthen partnerships as “Team MSU” to better support MSU and its resources.

This report contains a compilation of focus group data from eight focus groups representing 12 different campus customers/units who use the MSU Physical Plant project services. The data collected in these focus groups will provide valuable feedback to evaluate the process model for capital project delivery services. By design, the focus group process will help provide clarity of the perceptions within the campus community. In the interest of confidentiality, focus group participants are not named in this report by department or personal name, but they represent both the academic and operations sides of the University. Feedback has also been edited to remove other identifying material (names of people and projects, titles), but great care has been taken to ensure the heart of the comments remain.

The individual units that provided feedback in the focus groups are: Athletics, Residential and Hospitality Services, College of Osteopathic Medicine (including Macomb University Center and Detroit Medical Center), College of Natural Science, College of Music, Department of Theatre and Performing Arts, Veterinary Medicine, College of Engineering, Vice President for Finance and Operations, Land Management, and the Physical Plant Division itself.

Methodology
Feedback was collected by asking a standardized set of questions across all focus groups. Each facilitator compiled their own notes during the focus groups. The comments were then collected and reviewed by the facilitators. Each individual focus group included a review and discussion by the initiative’s facilitators. The data was then consolidated across the multiple focus groups and analyzed. There were nearly 900 comments collected, each one coded as being either positive, neutral, or negative, while also being categorized as referring to advocacy/trust, collaboration, coordination, or process clarity and information. Each of the tri-facilitators reviewed the data independently, and developed a set of themes or recommendations that were to be included in the final report. The group then met to discuss these topics and collaborate to develop a list of themes or recommendations for this report.

For your reference, the questions asked in the focus groups are included in Section three. All comments and feedback included in the dataset is also included in Appendix A. The individual comments are insufficient to provide the level of understanding required to analyze the feedback. What the dataset does not provide is the context and discussion that took place during each individual focus group, and how the comments were provided or the flow of the conversation.

The negative, or constructive nature of many comments collected in the focus groups may not accurately represent the overall satisfaction of the participants. There was generally a significant emphasis that most of the individuals involved are providing a high level of service, but may be limited by the process they are asked to navigate.
A few examples of comments that depict the overall satisfaction level include:

“If someone has idea to farm some of these things out, I would recommend otherwise. MSU people take great pride in what they do. If we ever lost that it would be bad. People who build buildings care, MSU people care about MSU”

“The sense of stewardship on campus is very high, and the culture is that stewardship is important, including the maintenance shops.”

“Our small projects have been designed by MSU EAS. I have been very pleased with our designs”

“We’re MSU – “we need all the help we can get, it’s a team sport and we’re MSU.”

“Never had to push through the door. People we work with are great”

“Physical Plant does a great job managing safety, security, communication/collaboration with outages. When you have people living to or adjacent to these projects it makes a difference to always know what is happening.”

“Reps do a great job bringing contractors on board and understanding our needs”

“I like the idea that people keep in great contact post-close out, one rep still contacts us once a month to make sure everything is OK. That’s awesome”.

“99.9% of people are good and doing best they can, but MSU Way team can define and help determine roles and process”

Themes
As the focus groups were conducted, it became apparent that there were a number of consistent themes across multiple focus groups. Some of the strongest and most consistent themes included:

- Many customers do not trust that they are getting all of the information they want/need to make informed decisions about their projects and to communicate the status of their project. When they ask for more information, many don’t feel that the project design and construction representatives are forthright in delivering it.

- There is not a known standard or documented process for delivering a capital project – or major construction project – on campus. This is true for those more “in the know” and those with very little experience with these types of projects.

- Those who know, or sort of know, the process (usually more internal customers/partners like RHS and Athletics) are not necessarily OK with it, but are living with it because they know who to contact, what processes to use or circumvent, general timelines and approval steps, etc. Those who are not familiar with the process (or lack thereof), are relatively lost and frustrated.
It is assumed that customers know more than they do or that they can easily find info they may want. Conversely, it is assumed that customers shouldn’t want to know as much as they want to know (budget, process) because it is handled for them. Could there be more of a focus on the customer when delivering services?

Many customers do not feel that Physical Plant/MSU service providers advocate for them and their best interests, but instead work to protect funds and/or contractors and other business partners.

Customers in science/medical/research facilities want an expert on the capital project delivery staff to advise them about their projects and best value, instead of them feeling they need to produce an in-house facilities/construction expert to advocate and provide facilities research for them on the project.

Most customers would like a single point of contact to rely on throughout the project. Handoffs are perceived as harmful to the project and confusing to the customer.

Customers are aware when they are pushed down the priority list for other, more high-profile projects. It gives the impression that their project is less important and Inhibits building trust with the customer staff.

There is a general lack of clarity regarding finishing a project. Customers do not know when their projects are complete, or most importantly, who “approves” its completion.

**Key questions**

These themes and conversations with the focus groups led the facilitators to ask a few key questions regarding project delivery.

What does the Physical Plant and its service partners want to promise customers? Should ALL requests (facility, ATS, Telecom, Land Management projects) go to the Physical Plant, or are there services that would better be provided by other parties because of workloads or best value considerations? Could this be defined so it can be communicated to the campus community in a more comprehensive style?

What is the appropriate balance regarding project delivery? How many resources? How much communication? How much money can be allocated to the management of the project delivery process?

How documented should our processes be? Is there a balance regarding rigid procedures that leave no leeway for individual approach and a systemic lack of a documented process?

Is there appropriate protocol and training of best practices of communication throughout all phases of the project with the customer(s)?
• Should the software solely drive the process and terminology? Customers may not care about internal systems, only that the expected level of service, communication, competency and engagement is provided.

Recommendations
In lieu of trying to answer the questions, the facilitators have provided a number of high-level recommendations that would help to countermeasure the themes that have been recognized, and may provide better customer support.

1. Document the process, including roles and responsibilities, timelines, glossary of terms, etc. Improve this where it can be improved (through MSU Way), and create a climate that facilitates learning, collaboration, and compliance with the established process – the “MSU Way.”

2. Establish subject matter experts in programming so projects kick off on a strong note, with identified key performance indicators and measurements. Use the resulting detailed programs as a means to minimize scope expansion and help with change control.

3. Publish a fee structure. Provide a list of all fees that are a burden to projects. Clarify the reason for them and make them consistent – no exceptions.

4. Develop a format to provide a detailed breakdown of preliminary cost assessments. Provide this for the customer with a brief explanation of the attributes of the job along with a scope of what is included and what, if it may impact the job, is excluded.

5. Set an expectation for the duration of projects. Publish an analysis and average timeframe for different size projects to move though feasibility, estimating, design and construction. Communicate the reason for the timeframes.

6. Develop a standard protocol for the close out phase of projects. Develop a training program for those involved in the close of projects. Provide the customer with a published guideline of what needs to take place during move in, building start up and operation, and the warranty period.

This is a summary of the recommendations that the committee has identified as the highest priority. The report goes into further detail of the recommendations, along with supporting statements and possible benefits if the recommendations are implemented in Section 4.

3. Focus Group Questions

The following is the list of questions that was asked during each focus group.

Introductory questions

1) What is your definition of a capital project?
2) What were your expectations of the process before initiating? (what you wanted it to be, even if that is not what it turned out to be – or if you already have an experience and you were expecting a repeat of that?)
3) What are your perceptions of the capital project process based on your experience?

**Process questions (process questions were asked with subcategories of what went well, and what would you improve)**

4) How do you initiate a capital project?
5) Can you walk us through your experience with:
   6) Estimating?
   7) Design?
   8) Construction?
   9) Close-out?
10) Let’s talk about different roles throughout the process. Was it clear what you were required to do?

**General performance questions**

11) In general, what would you do differently if you were in charge of the project delivery process? What business practices do you currently use that would beneficial to the capital project process?
12) List all the departments or entities that you recall interacting with during your capital project(s).
13) Were the services delivered seamlessly between the MSU service entities?
14) Did you identify key performance indicators and were they met? (Schedule, budget, yes – but more about awards, grants, more students – what your PROJECT NEED was)
15) If you had a choice, would you seek capital project services outside the university? Why or why not?
16) Is there anything else you’d like to discuss related to the capital project delivery process?

4. List of Recommendations

The following is a list of recommendations that the focus group facilitators have identified as possible enhancements to the project delivery process. Each one includes the recommendation, possible benefits that could come from the change, and a short list of sample supporting statements found in the dataset.

It should be noted that specific recommendations were not listed due to input from any one individual focus group, but by identifying themes across multiple groups and identifying where the process could be improved for the most benefit to the customer.

There was also an effort to emphasize the feedback that related to the process, and to de-emphasize feedback relating to specific individual management style or performance. A few supporting comments are provided after each recommendation in the table below as reference.
### Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Document the <strong>project delivery process</strong>, including average timelines, glossary of terms, etc.</td>
<td>• Build consistency in the project delivery method across multiple projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improve the process where it could be improved (through MSU Way); and create a climate that supports following the established process – the “MSU Way.”</td>
<td>• Provide a guideline for those on the project delivery team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build consistency in the project delivery method across multiple projects.</td>
<td>• Clarify the process for the customer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide a guideline for those on the project delivery team.</td>
<td>• Could provide a basis for training program for the customers and staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The process with the three-step (BOT) approval is slow, archaic, and does not allow for quick, effective, efficient delivery of capital projects**

**Clear there’s not a specific process, that’s part of what might come of this. Think there’s general confusion.**

**Need road map to see what process is as end unit and we didn’t see that.**

**It is unnecessarily complicated from beginning to end.** Even the point of creating an account to complete the darn thing, and that is only a small part in comparison to what someone like XXX has to handle when it gets to that point.

**I think we are weakest at the beginning and the end.**

**I want a road map: Who’s doing what and roles and who’s the point of contact.** Uncharted territory with tenant situations, but having a road map would have been helpful. Starting to codify all of this for these situations.

**We should streamline the BOT process, and we still need an HR class or video or something. I don’t want customers to be mad at me. If they know upfront, at least they will understand more.**

**The lack of a blue print is frustrating.**

**No expectations: Like walking down a dark alleyway because I didn’t know what was up. Very murky process – never had a sense of the process and end result.**

**I think the project management process overview – is there a clearly written plan of action? Does everyone have an opportunity to understand everything that is happening? How does the Communication/Collaboration happen throughout the project?**

**Certain amount of angst not knowing what process was. (wanted to clarify that not a criticism but an objective observation). Huge cast of characters there with them but didn’t know how all interacted and what to do as customer.**

**This is a big place already with less people to do more. Increasing bureaucracy hinders people’s ability to do job if their attitudes toward them. We’re peeling back layers, but it’s like the onion keeps getting bigger and bigger.**

**Why have we been doing this so long and not thought that a documented process is a good idea? We generally have successful projects but why does it have to be so undefined?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide a <strong>published guideline of the roles, responsibilities, and “handoffs”</strong></td>
<td>• Well-defined roles and responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
throughout a capital project.

- Establishes a mechanism/matrix for accountability between the different organizations involved in the process.

"This has been mentioned numerous times. It’s positive that we have good people who fill the gaps but performance could be overall improved with a better defined plan or division of responsibilities”.

"Did not have the same leadership at the XXXX project. A single person is needed to call for the project, someone who is from MSU that is following up and checking on things, talking leadership."

"What can we do to make your job easier?" Let us know how to tweak to make things smoother.”

“A single contact would have been great. Kind of confusing even during construction – knew XXX was there, but who was approving that work? They were doing a good job, but it was very frustrating.”

There is confusion for who is responsible for what.

“I could see what it was like with the recent renovation in our office. The hands change so much between people leading- that it was frustrating. Frequent changes so who do you go to? Need clearer lines of communication/collaboration and consistency.”

There is real lack of teamwork between depts. Our reno there was a PP component, then Telecom, then an ATS component – and it would have been nice for a PM to tell us what to do/who to contact. Not a real group effort to get the work done.

If we are all representing a piece of the project, we all come back together at end to hold each other accountable and know we all accomplished it. Not like that at PP – you don’t know who’s working on it or if it’s getting done or when it’s done.

It seems the interior design services group needs to market themselves and only seem to get invited whenever RHS feels like it. This is another inconsistency and the history and expertise of what works at the university is lost because of it.

Expectations : “Clearly defined/documented steps, processes, roles from 30,000 foot level and hand-offs”

With all of the overlapping responsibilities and roles, there should be more accountability for who gets charged to the job.

The wrong people are given a voice to send things back and say “no”. There’s a circuitous process because reps aren’t able to lead as rep for project/customer.

For smaller projects the designers are not always invited to construction meetings and vice versa. It’s a construction representative to designer issue as far as who is invited to progress meetings.

A lot of time the question comes up “Who has the final say?” – all teams have different roles but it isn’t all the way through a process – if it internally more clearly defined it would make it better for us.

Do you remember doing pre-focus groups with all parties before a project started? I thought that worked really well. It laid out the expectations at start and worked well.

I want a road map: Who’s doing what and roles and who’s point of communication?

We should standardize the process across all departments in the Division and across the University because
there are other players who do things differently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Send all process participants through the same delivery process training, so</td>
<td>• Communicate roles and accountability for individual performance of members on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all are navigating the same process, and operating under same standards and</td>
<td>the project team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations.</td>
<td>• Clarify responsibility and accountability of the different organizations as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as provide a guideline for outstanding service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supports idea currently being considered to expand RHS’s “Celebrate State”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>training to include all service units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anticipate leadership from U and individual unit/college to work together best and leverage resources of university. I would want any project to have appropriate leadership. In perfect world, that’s how to set up successful project.

“Common sense business stuff you’d want as a homeowner if you hired contractor to your site to provide services - General responsiveness: calls, emails returned.”

“There’s an adversarial relationship with people who come here. - and I don’t complain because I know I’ll be black-balled.”

The MSU interior design is not an apples-to-apples comparison because our internal design services does a lot more coordination with telecom or ATS and does a number of things that an interior design service firm doesn’t perform.

My biggest pet peeve w/ PP is calling someone to come in and look at something and you don’t know they came, don’t know what they did, and don’t know if it’s done. You get no feedback that it was completed.

This is why XXX college has hired (a facility person to look after projects) – to run interference with PP.

“Went to Purchasing in advance to try to get in front of ordering, we knew they were going to do and it was the “biggest black hole” he’s seen at the University. Not clear.”

“This goes back to personnel. Unless you can increase the responsiveness, or change the spirit of how they work with us - I wish I could put with them on a list and not work with them again. But, I don’t’ see how this will ever change”.

I think the success of the project is too dependent on which people are involved – because of model with different people with different backgrounds leading it, some are more interested in their discipline than the bigger picture project.

People were honest about chaos, so that honesty and sense of humor was appreciated, but things went very well despite criticisms. Said we were making it up as we go, which is OK, that’s where I live.

We should standardize the process across all departments in the Division and across the University because there are other players who do things differently.
A project had a temporary fix. We had to call the Physical Plant to remind them and they pointed out different Physical Plant departments that were “supposed to have done it.” It finally got done, but we had to remind them and work out who had the assignment.

What I expect of customer service pre, during and after service: Person checks in, they do the job, tell me it’s done, bill it, and a couple days later I get the call (customer callback). Not sure the call is necessary and calling is inconsistent based on project history.

As a professional, I would act like a professional: Return calls, common courtesy, run a customer service organization, and – Physical Plant needs to think of things in those terms – client already has a hard time with the University, so Physical Plant can help with customer service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5. Publish a fee structure. Provide a list of all fees that are a burden to projects. Clarify the reason for them and make them consistent – no exceptions. | • Provide clarity of the cost of doing business on campus.  
• Build trust within the campus community that the fee burden on projects is consistent across all units. |

All of the “add-ons” or fees are very frustrating. You can’t see what is being charged. There is no Communication/Collaboration.

One project was estimated at $$$$ and has gone to over double, we added some but it doubled from the original scope. Didn’t get work sheets to see the overhead. Internal est. sheet- MSU adds about 40% on top.

All these add-ons … you get a number from consultant for $10 million to build, then you tack on 20 to 30 percent for the actual project number. It’s ridiculous the things these projects have to fund on this campus.

All these fees get tossed in there. I finally learned to tack 30 percent on a project when I get an estimate from an architect. I know we need to pay some fees, but not all make sense and I don’t know what the charges are.

“Campus art is ridiculous.” I don’t mind a fee, but when it’s attached to every project, it’s ridiculous. Why don’t we pool money and pick key spots to place art to enhance the entire campus, but putting art on every project is a waste.

I keep hearing that people are mad about the fees, so then why is (PP) not funded through the University? The true frustration is not knowing what the fees are and if they are standard. There is a complete lack of clarity.

Need who, what, when, where, why. Need to know what being charged for. “Hear A LOT about overhead.”

This should be part of the customer training, explaining the fee structure and why it benefits them. It is interesting because we have customers all over the board – some who question every fee and some who don’t question anything.

We’ve found that contingencies are planned to use as part of budget. We don’t know if contingency is being used b/c it’s needed (?), or if it’s just being used up. PP sees it as theirs to spend, not as real contingency or something (we) could use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Consider publishing an analysis of the average duration of projects. Publish the</td>
<td>• May consistently set realistic expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
average timeframes for different types of projects to move through feasibility, estimating, design and construction. Communicate the reason for the timeframes.

- Allow customers to plan more accurately by building an understanding within their units of the timeframes and lead times for all size projects.
- Build trust that no one individual unit is a priority over another and services is consistent across all units.

The perception is that we always end up over budget and late, but I think that’s wrong. I don’t know what the stats are, but I think that’s wrong. I think it is a “misperception.”

Complications on the design end. Customer receives a grant and it will be a BOT project. We contact the person, and still no service request. Wanted to start months ago, but can’t start until BOT approval. We have to meet to keep her happy.

Now work not done until first of year and have researcher who needs space now. Asked designers how to abbreviate this, estimators told to avoid estimating step. As client, that is not acceptable. “Want us to just hand over our wallet.”

Customer perceives before the project starts that we’re already late. - We have a black eye and haven’t even started construction.

Abbreviate the timeline. Service request to work done. (April - service request sent, need est.to renovate.

for researchers who will start in fall. May, get a note from estimator. Designers only now looking at rooms. Reviewed at least three times with estimator.

As an institution, why don’t we let people know this is how we handle projects? (Timeframe of what it takes) Why don’t people know that?

Have demanded schedules and get minimal. Then recognize (if it will meet) and deal with it—that’s when run into problems and hear “we don’t have enough people … quite frankly, I don’t care, I need this job done, so how can we accomplish this goal”

I find frustration. I have a project now, it was started over a year ago, it can only be done in the summer – we kept going back to PP to get it handled and PP couldn’t give an update.

People think EAS is slow, they don’t understand the process that ties our hand. The campus community needs to be educated about the process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Develop a format to provide a detailed breakdown of <strong>preliminary cost</strong></td>
<td>• Give the customer the opportunity to make informed decisions and understand what is in the estimate and why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessments. Provide this for the customer with a brief explanation of the</td>
<td>• Build trust that there is a consistent estimating strategy across all units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributes of the job along with a scope of what is included and what, if it</td>
<td>• Help begin the dialogue regarding what the customer can provide funding for and the opportunity to choose by advantage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may impact the job, is excluded. Include a statement about the JIT status,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building service capacities, and potential haz-mat risk as part of the PCA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Estimate came to $XXX. Told we couldn’t afford and asked what it would cost to install X. I asked any economy of scale for reducing? He said nope, that was it. - requested and he said “no, we don’t share estimates, you wouldn’t understand it”</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s interesting when we get estimates that are way too high, and then we go back to PP and they are able to take all sorts of things out to revise, and it’s like “cool, but why didn’t you think of that before you wasted all of our time?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The estimates are very crude and don’t have enough detail. There is very little dialogue for give and take to understand how the project can come under budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to see more details than just the number.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I echo that. Need more detail there to understand costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want detail in the estimate: a scope of work, equipment needed - have spelled out what. I would like an estimate for labor and parts – we don’t know what percentage is labor or parts, the estimates are just lump sums.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy said forgot to add (equip) in the estimate. Then, it went (higher). He was rude and uncommunicative. So the program was cut and it took 8 months to get done. Cost came (higher)- had to go back to dean to ask for more money.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some standards were too elaborate (size of conduit), but not sure what drove all those things based on having to keep MSU buildings operational.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe there should be a charge for estimating because that is a lot of work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It is a fine line to walk and you don’t want to box in the creative people – you have to give them enough leeway to find the best solution – it is hard for budget-driven people.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Possible Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **8.** Establish subject matter experts in **programming** so projects kick off on a strong note, with identified key performance indicators and measurements. When full programs are completed, limit program changes and create a process authorizing any change to the program by the funding source. | • Provide better problem definition and clarify key performance indicators for a project.  
• Provide a more thorough programming document to serve as a roadmap through the design phase.  
• May provide better estimates at the Step 1 – Authorization to Plan phase. |
| *I think we need to get better at our programming statements as the client before meetings.*  
*Key Performance Indicators? - what are they, who develops, who tracks and how are they tracked*  
*If we are saying we have $15 mil, we have $15 mil all in – sometimes it seems to get lost in translation and they design a more expensive project. “We would save so much money if people would just listen.”*  
*They are not always just for our department to decide. There are numerous stakeholders involved and the project leads should make sure there is a clear picture of all stakeholder goals or KPI’s.*  
*There is no formal process to follow up if the KPI’s are met. This should include more than on time and under budget. Did we meet the objectives of why we invested the money?*  
*Our department claims tremendous value using the PMI – We have also used with internal processes.*  
*We need more accurate estimates. There’s too much change from the design estimate to the bids. It could kill the project if it’s too high.*  
*I would keep key performance indicators in front of the group – maybe we get a little lost and need something to bring us back to the path.*  
*Physical Plant Landscape Services: What are you planting? They always seem to overplant buildings based on what resources we have to maintain them. We are taking landscaping out because we don’t have the manpower to maintain it.* |
| **9.** Consider developing specialized project managers or zone managers with expertise in research/science/medical facilities. Maintain a level of consistency with who manages those types of projects. | • Build trust and confidence among these types of customers toward the project delivery participants.  
• This does not have to be limited to only research and science facilities, but may help to provide better service through expertise. |
| *“In science and labs, need to revise/renovate labs regularly. We press on with research in this department. But, “Every time we go through these projects it’s heartache and frustration.”* |
“Zone managers - do you have anyone like that? We have somebody to focus on this, but don’t have zone engineer/SME who has expertise in their area.”

“I expected that the Phys Plant would bring more expertise to the project. I don’t feel that we got the value returned for the amount of fees that we pay. We have very technical projects that are specific to the research.”

Taking knowledge with them to the next project – Phys Plant rep did that from old to new project – was a steep learning curve and a different animal We could have built something cheaper, faster, easier if we had a more collaborative planning.

There is not enough interaction/communication/collaboration. The faculty are not experts so they cannot critique the design. Only when things are grossly off can they tell.

Six weeks later, got the designer and had to go through entire process with designers. I’m not the reearchers. Four months/six months later, I won’t remember all the details, so I have to pull the researcher back in.

**Recommendation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10. Publish an internal guideline for communicating spending during entire course of the project with the customer organization/point of contact. | • Provide a guideline for internal service providers to keep the customer organization informed of the budgetary status of the project throughout all phases of the project.  
• Increase trust and transparency. |

On project XXX only department rep was allowed at meetings – Physical Plant rep was brought in at bidding and told to build the project – and was in overhead immediately – had to ask for more money multiple times.

If FPSM is managing contingency, the customer gets nothing back.

Capital projects where we are working with the Phys Plant construction companies, that info is pretty accurate and available, it’s when you’re doing the $20,000 project that comes in at $35,000 that we don’t have any tracking.

It was remarkable how many times we would ask how much money had been spent and how there was not a clear answer to this.”

There’s no communication/collaboration about the needs or requirements. They don’t give out detailed worksheets. It’s frustrating. It’s not a secret. Every single change not enough detail. We are told they don’t release the detailed numbers.

Communication went to local level. Felt disconnect from budget office when it moved into construction – not sure if just him having hard time letting go, or normal maturation of project or whatever, but felt disconnect.

Five months later you get a call asking “how did we do on the project”? By then, I don’t even remember what the project was. So the whole system from beginning to end needs a change.

Problem because the money is held too long. Why is it held so long and why can’t (we) get an update regarding the budget at substantial completion.

I understand change orders and the need for them, but many people don’t understand because they are never involved in projects, We are going to have change orders, thats why we have contingencies

The process – I sat in one conversation about XXXX and thought it was cool and impressive how they figured it
out and made cuts together.

A number of years now –when I came on, we felt we weren’t getting the service from project reps. Budgets meant nothing; money had to come out of our wallets. We coordinate when we have to, but hire own contractors, etc. when we can.

At the end of the project there is no communication/collaboration of when the money is going to be given back. Who should be managing this? Who is the person managing cost control? There is no transparency.

Hours tracking is not clear. Put on billables, if two people are needed per XXX standards, then maybe explain that.

“I had waves of terror – never knew what was going on totally.” It was a train that moved and all turned out good, but never a detailed budget – not sure if should have been, but had angst about that.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11. Develop a standard protocol for the close-out phase of projects. Develop a training program for those involved in the close of projects. Provide the customer with a published guideline of what needs to take place during move-in, building start-up and operation, and the warranty period. | • Build an understanding within customer units of the different activities that need to occur to close out a project.  
• Provide a consistent approach and guideline for individuals representing the Physical Plant during the close-out phase.  
• Develop expectations for the building occupants of the different problems that can and will occur during the move-in and the first year of a newly completed project. |

We need somebody to stay on top of project and makes sure it gets done in time allotted for. I know we got lots of emails about it.

At the end of the project there is no communication/collaboration of when the money is going to be given back – Who should be managing this? Who is the person managing cost control? There is no transparency.

For a new elevator, the first year we had to call the contractor ourselves. PP wouldn’t provide service. Note I do love PP, I don’t want to come across as being anti-PP, they do wonderful job. It is just odd that a customer has to call contractor.

A project that had a temporary fix. We had to call the PP to remind them and they pointed out different PP departments that were “supposed to have done it” – it finally got done, but we had to remind them and work out who had the assignment.

We finally had someone from Phys Plant over, and it got figured out and done. We had to take it to someone at central Administration to get it done. If this were Athletics, would this be tolerated? We were very pleased it got done.

We had to do work to make our building ADA accessible. It was embarrassing because there were two meetings where it was supposed to be demonstrated and it wasn’t done.

XXX (person) walked through whole punch-list with me and that was very valuable.

Unresolved issue- (project) complete last (year)-still not done. When ask (project rep), response is “GC guys
busy at other MSU jobs and can’t get to mine” I don’t give a damn b/c this project should be (finished). How bout we finish 1 job before starting other?

Paperwork is ridiculously slow. We closed out one project and years after it was done and got a huge charge to the project. I’m paying a fee for that?

We don’t know when it’s done. It’s just assumed after a while. It looks like it’s done, so we assume it’s done. It might be nice to get a check-off list from PP that it’s done from their perspective.

Someone needs to come back after a year. We need a six-month and 12-month review.

There is NO follow up to say that the project is done. Need to hear from PP that it’s done. We don’t even go through the punch list. I need you guys to tell me when you are done. Both physical labor and financial part.

The customer thinks the project is closed out, and then they still keep getting charges to their accounts.

You should get some sort of feedback that it’s done or what the status is. We put in 10 requests a week, maybe 10 in a day. I don’t want to have to follow up. I want the PP to let me know it’s done.

My biggest pet peeve with PP is calling someone to come in and look at something and you don’t know they came, don’t know what they did, and don’t know if it’s done. You get no feedback that it was completed.

Of all the areas we discussed today, there’s a vast amount of improvement that can occur here (closeout), time-wise. The project reps need to hold the contractor’s feet to the fire to get documents done, close out, get punch-list items done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12. Establish **standard project documentation templates** that will be used consistently to communicate about projects and services. (Ex: charter, program statement, detailed estimate sheet, schedule/timeline/calendar, detailed budget tracking sheet, meeting notes, project closeout, service slips, etc.) Train individuals to use and hold people accountable. | • Develop a guideline for internal service providers to provide a consistently high level of service to the customer organization.  
• Provide the customer with documented processes to build an understanding of the requirements of the work.  
• Increase trust and transparency. |

Think it’s clear that our planning group doesn’t even know how it got going or how parties got involved.

We should standardize the process across all departments in the Division and across the University because there are other players who do things differently.

Single largest concern is “consistent, reliable communication/collaboration about the process and the progress of that project.”

At the end of the project there is no communication/collaboration of when the money is going to be given back. Who should be managing this? Who is the person managing cost control? There is no transparency.

I could see what it was like with the recent renovation in our office. The hands change so much between people leading that it was frustrating … Who do you go to? Need clearer lines of communications/collaboration and
Sometimes they leave sticky notes to let you know they are there. If my name is on a requested work order, they can contact me to let me know the project status.

There’s no communication/collaboration about the needs or requirements. They don’t give out detailed worksheets. It’s frustrating. It’s not a secret. Every single change there’s not enough detail. We are told they don’t release the detailed numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Establish a <strong>customer support center</strong> that will field all customer inquiries for all service units. Train <strong>customer service reps</strong> (CSRs) and/or advocates to be the central point of contact for requesting all levels of service (from trouble calls to major construction). They would field requests, assign requests, and follow up with customers and service providers if needed.</td>
<td>• Build a consistent, easy-to-contact, easy-to-use customer services hub to assist all customers through both small and large projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Develop an <strong>online “library” of projects and service</strong> completed at buildings/offices so same people can be consulted on recurring problems.</td>
<td>• Provide an easy-to-find, self-explanatory one-stop shop for providing services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Service provider partners should establish <strong>routine training workshops</strong> to help customers use online service requests, review statements during/after projects, access online repository of shutdowns, etc. Increase outreach and customer engagement.</td>
<td>• Build a consistent questionnaire to guide the customer through their contact with the Physical Plant so that project tasks do not get “missed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide a guideline for individual service providers for a consistent level of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide the customer with more information regarding what services the Physical Plant is providing and what services may be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Better service to campus customers so that they can easily understand the “how to” of working with the Physical Plant and how to navigate the process accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I find it hard to separate. I’ve been on campus long time and know where to go for answers, but someone new to campus wouldn’t know where to start. You can make a lot of phone calls and go wrong route before knowing where to go first.

Sometimes they come in with service requests that make no sense, or go from memory and ask people in building to fill in blanks about where work is needed.

The PP is fabulous for emergencies, but for scheduled work is where they seem to fall down. Some are three or four years old.

It is difficult to figure out who to talk to and what is needed and how it all works.
Know really knowledge-base/education, something to reference to say “XXX has called 15 times on this.” No historical data base to reference. Way it is now, “it seems like we’re wasting a lot of money.”

Billings with open orders “horrible.” “No documentation about what was actually performed. Are told b/c supposed to be quick fix, but hard to recall in a year what money spent on when no documentation.

Common service request when call someone for basic service – would be really nice if they checked in with WHO ISSUED service request vs. someone at door. Touch base with actual requestor. They come and go and I didn’t even know.

Thinking of Steve Jobs. He made things that work, and had people that make things work. All customers want is to get the job done. The thing is why not have a liaison/ombudsman for building projects instead of submitting service request?

$1400 charge goes to our money guys, but it does not say “who, what, when, where, why” – have no idea what the charges are for. - when you ask about it, they send screenshot of FAMIS and expect that they will know what that is.

Giant oil stain left on door for parent’s weekend. I shouldn’t have to call Custodial, Key Shop, Carpentry, etc. “One call should do it all.”

I don’t know where to go or start, even small capital projects. It’s not clear where to go if you’re going to get same story.

You can make the same phone call twice and get a different answer.

My biggest pet peeve with PP is calling someone to come in and look at something and you don’t know they came, don’t know what they did, and don’t know if it’s done. You get no feedback that it was completed.

Five months later you get a call asking “how did we do on the project?” By then, I don’t even remember what the project was. So the whole system from beginning to end needs a change.

Service requests: You don’t know if you go to Interior Design or to Phys Plant. Most of the time it has to go through the building folks. Confusing to know who to send to?

Maybe implement a 1-800 number to report issues, complaints. People don’t know who to call when they have issues so they don’t get resolved.

Waste of money, ex. Lights continued to go off with sensor. Over two years. Every time sent a diff person out to troubleshoot. No one researches. They all came up with the same idea.

Know really knowledge-base/education, something to reference to say “XXX has called 15 times on this.” No historical data base to reference. Way it is now, “it seems like we’re wasting a lot of money.”

Need EBS-type system to review projects at any time would be very helpful. It was remarkable how many times we would ask how much money had been spent and how there was not a clear answer to this.

Service requests. You don’t know if go to Interior Design or to Phys Plant. Most of the time it has to go through the building folks. Confusing to know who to send to?

FAMIS is confusing to use. -We are stuck using the terminology of a program that doesn’t fit with other people’s definition of a capital project.” We used to call them “card numbers.”

We have to dig up the email that says service request was received, follow up with the persons assigned and then they respond in the next day. It’s like you have to remind them they have the jobs.

There is nowhere online where someone can see the status of their project. They receive a memo from EAS, but
We don't know where to start getting the information – had to figure it out alone – is there a way to figure it out for Physical Plant – we need something simple to locate people. We end up calling the XXX or PP main number to find the right person.

I would expect leadership from University and associated units, meaning single points of contact and reference, accessibility to resources in those areas, responses to questions/support.

It is unclear how many service requests I have to send to get a project complete i.e. telecom, furniture, move in, ATS....

### Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16. For smaller jobs and single trade work, consider using a **standard or set pricing strategy**. This could apply to such jobs as white board or bulletin board hanging, hardware installation, electrical receptacle installation, “window shaker” air conditioner installation, (the list could be quite lengthy) | • Build trust in the pricing strategy of small tasks performed by the Physical Plant.  
• Allow customers to better plan and budget their small-scale renovations or relocations. |

The quote is what people expect to pay. Going back many years, we requested electrical outlets, and it came to $1,500 - outrageous, and then there was the question of are you going to for sure charge that or only what it costs to put it in?

We can order a truck to move things around campus and one day it’s $100 and the other day its $500. We are told it’s different employees/different pay scales. It’s frustrating to see major discrepancies in the cost of the moving services.

---

### Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Determine how to <strong>address the shuffling of projects/customers to accommodate high-profile and fast timeline</strong> projects so all customers feel their project is important and priority</td>
<td>• To build trust within the customer base that other projects are not “more important” than their own.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phys Plant people are at our job and then get called away to other “more important” project, that happens more than once and gets frustrating. This came up recently – it went on and on – some due to weather, but lots due to being called away.

We feel like we are not important. People have six other projects going on besides yours.

We felt like we were put on backburner.

Unresolved issue- (project) complete last (year)-still not done. When ask (proj rep), response is “GC guys busy at other MSU jobs and can’t get to mine” I don’t give a damn b/c this project should be(finished). How bout we finish 1 job before starting another?

A small person doesn’t get the customer service big customers get, so big customers probably like us and smaller customers probably don’t like us.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Develop an online repository of all service shutdowns, closures, etc., so people can review at their leisure any service alerts that may impact them (modeled after ATS Service Alerts), but specific to facilities services.</td>
<td>• Better service to campus customers so that they can easily identify the cause of problems or inconveniences and how to plan around them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It gets posted the day before. Early notices are good, but the occupants have to get the message. The message PP is trying to convey is not clear. On steam tunnel notice, but real message is “can’t use parking lot” – but no one mentioned that.

Communication/Collaborations notices. They send one notice and we have to revise it so it’s something pertinent and easy to read. Have to go through ¾ of the way to understand what the message is.

They scare the neighbors, too. HAZMAT suits all in one office. Asbestos in carpet adhesive and that is disconcerting when no notification. Or notification that is vague. Had to call to ask for more info. “Was satisfied once I called.”

In short, notices that make perfect sense to PP, doesn’t make any sense to the client.

Physical Plant does a great job managing safety, security, Communication/Collaborations with outages. When you have people living to or adjacent to these projects it makes a difference to always know what is happening.

We don’t know where to start getting the information – had to figure it out alone – is there a way to figure it out for Physical Plant – we need something simple to locate people. We end up calling the XXX or PP main number to find the right person

Need EBS-type system to review projects at any time would be very helpful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Develop a consistent method to continuously improve the project delivery process.</td>
<td>• Continuously improve the interaction and services that are provided to the campus community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Document lessons learned

There is no formal process to follow up if the KPI’s are met. This should include more than on time and under budget. Did we meet the objectives of why we invested the money?

As-builts. We don’t seem to give a rat about these. No one verifies them.” Nobody can believe what the as-builts are. “Virtually every project I run into, as-builts are horrible.” Sure would be nice to be somewhat reliable

We should survey customers and find out where their frustrations are and educate them more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Possible Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Define what the Physical Plant and its service partners want to promise customers. Define services and service values and market appropriately.</td>
<td>• May provide clarity and serve as a guideline to Physical Plant services providers on an individual and organizational basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think that everything is over-engineered and it ends up costing too much.

My husband works on campus. When something needs to be done, he just says to call ‘the Physical Plant.’ They don’t differentiate departments or estimates, need to look at doing things the same? Customers call us all ‘the Physical Plant’

If I send something to ‘Physical Plant’ to get estimate and I’m getting different responses (PCAs, estimates, whatever it’s called in different departments) back from different departments it’s confusing to me.

If someone has idea to farm some of these things out, I would recommend otherwise. MSU people take great pride in what they do. If we ever lost that it would be bad. People who build buildings care, MSU people care about MSU

There is a trust gap. “Every time I have to do something I think ‘here comes another headache down the road.’”

We are very fortunate to have our relationship with Physical Plant – some colleagues are left high and dry – we have never missed one of those deadlines.

Used to be a time they would encourage you to go look at other operations and if you could prove that better deal was outside PP, then you could do that.” Not like that anymore – doesn’t seem to be a price check.

What is our company line that we are towing, though? Do we want people to handle certain things on their own? Should we give them guidelines?

Would like to list preferred vendors whose work is trusted/follow MSU specs for pricing and make choice from those. “I could have Managed the project faster/efficient than PP person and less expensively.” “Would use outside parties every time.”

Do departments have to come to the Phys Plant with a good idea of what they need to do and they go with guidance from there? Can they come to PP with just an idea and have the PP really lead the project and guide them?

The greening of the University is extremely important. I or no one else here would question that. LEED certification is a credit to the University.

Personal opinion = XXXX should always be involved with capital projects to help them through process (service requests, when and what to do). XXX knows all the intricacies of what is needed at MSU

All buildings should be built through Phys Plant. Bad for XXX, but that is where all building projects should be.
But need to be responsive to costs, standards, timelines, budgets, etc. (If PP met their needs, they would want the PP to do the work).

Should have remained with PP doing XXX projects but essentially service, cost, results not up to par.

There are things like ceiling tiles that we are just better off buying ourselves.

I have been told by operations for painting that it’s OK to do our own small paint jobs because they are all overworked and can’t get to them all.

In order to maintain integrity and standards the University has in place, the end result is to work with the Phys Plant and not circumvent the process, “but will I go out and look for someone who can do it a whole lot less expensively, yes”

Are they pricing things so high for little projects so we don’t come to them and do it ourselves or what?
Appendix A

Record Comments Dataset
a. What is your definition of a capital project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“MSU Way” involves more than just capital projects I think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A project that is close to a million dollars or over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Any project that goes to the Board of Trustees (BOT) for approval; over $1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>If I have to pay the PP to do it – doesn’t have to go to BOT. Have to have something to show for it at the end of the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In science and labs, need to revise/renovate labs regularly. We press on with research in this department. But, “Every time we go through these projects it’s heartache and frustration.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Zone managers - do you have anyone like that? We have somebody to focus on this, but don’t have zone engineer/SME who has expertise in their area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Over a million and goes to BOT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It is anything that goes through the EAS office. It is based on FAMIS – on how to put a schedule in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Why pick “capital”? I never knew what a capital project was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>There is a difference between data codes in FAMIS, so that’s where the differences between capital projects and other projects are. Use budget codes with capital projects, but not with other projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>When I hear “capital” it means something that is an improvement to the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Does it have to be BOT-approved? Answer: No. If it goes through EAS, it is a capital project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Is it still important for someone to keep the differences between capital projects and other projects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I have strong arguments for not making everything a capital project through EAS – a window AC is not a capital project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>When I think of capital projects, I think it’s, in the simplest terms, a delivery method.” - If it requires design. - That is not a definitive definition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>If it requires design, EAS and Maintenance determine if it needs design and then send the service request to the appropriate department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Is it important what the definition is? - In terms of language, it is important when thinking of EBS, Kuali, etc. “The language people use is important.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I think it is an important question because if there is a way to somehow define it, even with our own group, it would be a step in the right direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FAMIS is confusing to use. -We are stuck using the terminology of a program that doesn’t fit with other people’s definition of a capital project.” We used to call them “card numbers.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. What were your expectations of the process before initiating?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Listening vs. telling us what we need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>The process with the three-step (BOT) approval is slow, archaic, and does not allow for quick, effective, efficient delivery of capital projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>“There’s just not lots of flexibility if the state plops money in your lap.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Design development, lots of meetings, plan reviews, opportunities for input, and opportunities to meet with end users to understand expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>It’s more personnel issue, than organizational. I’ve been dealing with this for xx years. Its the personnel, not the system. The antagonistic relationship. They are trying to do the least amount of work and I have to deal with the result.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common sense business stuff you’d want as a homeowner if you hired contractor to your site to provide services - General responsiveness: calls, emails returned.

Professional behavior - “I think it is lacking with PP”

If there’s a lawn mower on site - mow it like your grandma’s house. Same thing - Personal ownership of projects

There’s an adversarial relationship with people who come here. - and I don’t complain because I know I’ll be black-balled.

I personally don’t agree with xxxx (another person in focus group) and I am a person who does not stop. Nothing is done around here, if no one is on the top of it.

What can we do to make your job easier?” Let us know how to tweak to make things smoother.

What I expect of customer service pre, during, and after service: Person checks in, they do the job, tells me it’s done, bill it, couple days later I get the call. Not sure call is necessary and calling is inconsistent based on project history.

Never involved in project from beginning to end. To be involved in the process, I sat in on biweekly meetings with Maintenance. They would ask questions of me as an end user of the process.

Single largest concern is “consistent, reliable Communication/Collaboration about the process and the progress of that project.”

I could see what it was like with the recent renovation in our office. The hands change so much between people leading- that it was frustrating. Frequent changes so. Who do you go to? Need clearer lines of Communication/Collaboration and consistency.

A single contact would have been great. Kind of confusing even during construction – knew XXX was there, but who was approving that work? They were doing a good job, but it was very frustrating.

Difficult to distinguish because I knew who to go to all the time, so I was searching him out a lot. Needed a list of what we are supposed to do and when. - different things that I needed to do and didn’t know, so delay of weeks until I did my part.

Anticipate leadership from U and individual unit/college to work together best and leverage resources of university. I would want any project to have appropriate leadership. In perfect world, that’s how to set up successful project.

Can’t start a project without funding, which involves some sort of development effort and Approval to Plan requires you to explain the funding - Customer needs to explain what it is.

Clear there’s not a specific process, that’s part of what might come of this. Think there’s general confusion.

Clearly defined/document steps, processes, roles from 30,000 foot level and hand-offs

Consistency = high level understanding of the process

Control piece was difficult b/c didn’t have full control over whole process.

Did most of planning of these before PP got involved. Did adjustments and budget and initial design? Pre PP? Probably burned a lot of resources around the table.

Follow the money. These projects were off-campus and so unique.
For smaller scale projects, once they’re approved, the current process has worked extremely well.

I ask and answer many questions so that I may submit an accurate and detailed service request (including drawings) for the scope of the project. Hopefully, the more information I can provide the better the estimate.

I do not know that I have had expectations of the process. The majority of the capital projects I’ve been involved in were for new faculty hires, retention packages, and building infrastructure changes.

I don’t know what to do or how to go about it, I would love to have a Phys plant person as a contact.

I expected that the phys plant would bring more expertise to the project. I don’t feel that we got the value returned for the amount of fees that we payed. We have very technical projects that are specific to the research.

I find it hard to separate. I’ve been on campus long time and know where to go for answers, but someone new to campus wouldn’t know where to start. You can make a lot of phone calls and go wrong route before knowing where to go first.

I had high expectations because of meetings and upfront planning. Thought had great team which started from other meetings. Detail way up front and interaction from PP had been great.

I think it depends on the person.

I think the project initiation comes on a higher level.

I would expect leadership from University and associated units, meaning single points of contact and reference, accessibility to resources in those areas, responses to questions/support.

If people are involved the entire time they take ownership and know all of the background.

If we miss a deadline on a building we lose a whole year and we can’t recover.

If you want it to be delivered on time and get what you expected then you have to be involved in the process – people have to understand what problems we are trying to solve.

It is a learning curve with new people, but we have tried to keep our projects operating the same – all are capable, but there is definitely a learning curve.

It’s impossible to deliver projects in a reasonable amount of time because of the approvals.

Key Performance Indicators = what are they, who develops, who tracks and how are they tracked.

Need road map to see what process is as end unit and we didn’t see that.

Now with recent project, Phys Plant rep has been involved the entire time.

No expectations: Like walking down dark alleyway b/c didn’t know what was up, very murky process – never had a sense of the process and end result.

Not same leadership with this project b/c didn’t have XXX. Was confusion about whether to call XXX or Phys Plant or what. So concur with XXX that need a single person to call. Need go-to person who will follow up and keep on point.
Now would be most grateful now that XXX are there to have a single point of contact to call and say what's what and check in. Whatever we are supposed to do, need tools to collect tuition.

On project XXX only department rep was allowed at meetings – Physical Plant rep was brought in at bidding and told to build the project – and was in over head immediately – had to ask for more money multiple times.

One thing we learned on project XXX was the expectation that there would be a smooth transition between the design and construction people.

Our expectations are that EAS will craft a design that is best for us while still being within budget.

Our office did all the work to make sure documents were clean and good so he didn’t have to spend time on that. XXX to keep easier for him. Can’t imagine at XXX not having staff that does that stuff.

Process have changed - used to go through VPFO - it moved far quicker - “Now it’s so unwieldy, it’s difficult, but maybe that’s the way the institution wants it.”

Start with PP to get estimate . Start with PP to get estimate . With these facilities is independent from other system. I don’t know what the proportion is.

Taking knowledge with them to the next project – Phys Plant rep did that from old to new project – was a steep learning curve and a different animal We could have built something cheaper, faster, easier if we had a more collaborative planning.

They wanted to go back to the old way, but we want the new way because we work better with the construction reps that way, but everyone is not yet engaged.

Think of the different types of projects we are working on – there are different clients and needs – why is it different when we are building academic buildings opposed to residence halls?

Unique arrangement b/c are tenants in the building.

We have had expectations that the Physical Plant Division is the lead for the projects, have responsibility of the board – we have to be good customers/good clients to the project

Went to Purchasing in advance to try to get in front of ordering knew they were going to do and it was the “biggest black hole” he’s seen at the U. Not clear.

What do we do for smaller projects – do you have to get BOT approval or is that just signatory? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?

Who is considered Physical Plant?

Worrying about things and construction process so --don’t have to worry about it. XXXX usually orders equipment and such, is that something PP usually does or who does that specifying?

XXX came out and checked in and went well. Now, XXX is here every week for meetings for execution of project.

You are bringing experts in at different times in the project – there is a lot of responsibility of the Physical Plant employee to deal and cope with all of these different people and who they are and their part in the process.

You can make the same phone call twice and get a different answer.
## c. What are your perceptions of the capital project process based on your experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Smooth, open, no surprises, developed such great trust level – trust they understand me and will give me what I want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>The perception is that we always end up over budget and late, but I think that's wrong. I don’t know what the stats are, but I think that's wrong. I think it is a “misperception.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>I think we are very “involved.” I think the process can be simplified. I came from the outside, and I feel that the capital project process has too many hurdles. Things that are forced to happen that make it difficult to be streamlined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>We have outside A/E design whole projects, but plans have to be done in-house. Contractors do some things and then we have to have other things done in-house. If we can hire contractors, then why can some be done in-house and others can’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>When you are the person making sure the project is successful, you wonder if all these coordinations are necessary. You usually inherit the plan. I’m not saying our forces are doing it bad – they do good work – it’s just more coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>The issue is a bit of not scheduling in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>It is unnecessarily complicated from beginning to end.” Even the point of creating an account to complete the darn thing, and that is only a small part in comparison to what someone like Andy has to handle when it gets to that point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>What does the Administration building want out of these? What should we track, and what should we report on? To me, we use capital projects too much. What do they want us to handle and how do we react to that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>I don’t like the way the Phys. Plant person has treated me. My contact had been back to work for four days but hadn’t listened to voicemails. He doesn’t check his email or phone, - “It’s just a nightmare.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Been saying this for 25 years, that PP is worst managed entity on campus. And you can ask any professor here. It’s like dealing with bandits and thieves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>OK with those types of projects and requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>A number of years now -when I came on, we felt we weren’t getting the service from project reps. Budgets meant nothing; money had to come out of our wallets. We coordinate when we have to, but hire own contractors, etc. when we can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>We get estimate from PP and get an outside estimate and its 1/3 of the cost. Same product, same standards. We are building 40-year standard on farms, but can’t get PP to realize that it’s OK to build to a lesser standard when it’s on farms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Had EAS Designer tell me that if I didn’t go along with him, he would not work with us on future projects. Had to rat him out to the dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>This goes back to personnel. Unless you can increase the responsiveness, or change the spirit of how they work with us -I wish I could put them on a list and not work with them again.” But, I don’t see how this will ever change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Rely on a lot of student labor and then all sorts of mistakes b/c not professional workers devoted to it. Don’t utilize student workers to do inspections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Planned lunches to drive around to take naps. Wasted time. “General lack of accountability or sense of exceeding expectations. They’ll do the bare minimum and no one checking in to make sure they’re doing the best job they can.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
117 It’s all about service, products comes out and really meeting what the desires are of the group. It’s all about services. I spent a lot of time to understand what is required.

118 Fear of raising too much heck and we won’t get service.

119 XXX has been one of better ones as far as meetings, presentations, and submittals. There are gems with PP. I hope something will come out of this.

120 Enjoy working with service personnel, skilled trades personnel. Process is what ties everyone hands.

121 I find personnel difficult to work with – adversarial, unresponsive, etc.

122 Maybe they leave you a message that you aren’t going to respond to. Would prefer email.

123 They come w/o gear to complete projects even though you’ve told them the problem. They have to go to get all gear in order to waste time. Happens all the time and is deliberate.

124 Culture thing – have also heard this. “Lots of featherbedding at PP.” Two people for one job.

125 Grounds crew has more featherbedding – looks like people just driving around. Looks like nothing to do. Go to Clin Center at 8 am – group of people at xxxx because place to not be observed.

126 Complications on the design end. Customer receives a grant and it will be a BOT project. We contact the person, and still no service request. Wanted to start months ago, but can’t start until BOT approval. We have to meet to keep her happy.

127 In our own EAS renovation, we didn’t treat our own people like we do our customers. No meeting minutes or ensuring customers were happy with the plans. We didn’t treat it like regular projects because it was “our family.”

128 I am happy with the end result, but the whole experience going through that was frustrating. I don’t know how this feels to outside customers.

129 Major projects are cumbersome and take a long time.

130 Customer perceives before the project starts that we’re already late. - We have a black eye and haven’t even started construction.

131 As an institution, why don’t we let people know this is how we handle projects. (Timeframe of what it takes) Why don’t people know that?

132 Not only that the BOT demanded these processes, the MSU community demanded more input and notice before these projects are a go - The crux behind the whole thing was to better communicate with the community, not only the BOT.

133 Agreed. Not a bad thing, just how the process went.

134 Certain amount of angst not knowing what process was. (wanted to clarify that not a criticism but an objective observations). Huge cast of characters there with them but didn’t know how all interacted and what to do as customer.

135 Did not have the same leadership at the XXXX project. A single person is needed to call for the project, someone who is from MSU that is following up and checking on things, talking leadership.

136 Early on the U was comfortable with A/E as leadership and handed off to A/E and was that the process.

137 I don’t know where to go or start, even small capital projects. it’s not clear where to go or if you’re going to get same story.
138 I feel like the Phys Plant reps are more an advocate for the A/E or the Constructor. We need them to be an advocate for us.

139 I have a hard time breaking it out to be just the Physical Plant’s responsibility – as a rep we should be able to be proactive and ask questions to get information we need to be successful.

140 I think distinguishing roles is the hardest part of the process – the process piece of project XXX having Physical Plant field inspectors on the site evaluating what would and would not work.

141 I think it has gotten a lot better in the past six or seven years.

142 I think that everything is over-engineered and it ends up costing too much.

143 I think the engineering aspects are lacking – how is this thing going to be built when we are always waiting for feedback from architects and engineers?

144 I think the success of the project is too dependent on which people are involved – because of model with different people with different backgrounds leading it, some are more interested in their discipline than the bigger picture project.

145 I think we sort of answered it before – we’ve had good experiences with people from Physical Plant and some not good experiences.

146 It is going to be long and involve a lot of people.

147 It is sometimes unclear who is in charge, and after transitions who is in charge

148 It is unclear how many service requests I have to send to get a project complete i.e. telecom, furniture, move in, ATS....

149 It seemed like the whole project was driven more by the architect

150 It worked.

151 It’s chaotic and inconsistent.

152 Lease not paid out to Land Management.

153 Lot of moving parts that did move in sync, but were very unclear, especially bidding parts. So not having a sense of that, never knew the rules of engagement with that – extremely frustrating and confusing.

154 Not sure with our setup and being a tenant that one person only could have done it. The entire staff supported this project, so would have been very challenging for one person (and from East Lansing).

155 Now you go into a project and know what everyone’s role is.

156 One of the things to be successful on a team is to effectively communicate.

157 People were honest about chaos, so that honesty and sense of humor was appreciated, but things went very well despite criticisms. Said we were making it up as we go, which is OK, that’s where I live.

158 Projects were fairly technical
Requires someone from host site to be very involved.

Rule of thumb that XXX explained was that if something bid through XXX, XXX could work as the intermediary. If outside of that, had to work with XXXX.

Seeing some of same characteristics now with XXXX – no single point. Lots of groups working, but same characteristics emerging as with off-campus projects we’ve discussed.

Start with XXX leadership, then transition to XXX – XXX was part of that – was successful ending because we are delivering curriculum. So it worked.

Strength of resources of partnering institutions was key

Tenants comfortable working with A/E (all agreed)

The process can require a significant amount of input to keep a project moving toward completion.

There is overlap of responsibilities that leads to Communication/Collaboration problems

There are things like ceiling tiles that we are just better off buying ourselves.

There is not a documented process or definition to who does what

This was the first time these people have been involved in the design process.

Unclear.

Unorganized, doesn't keep project going, timeliness, missing meetings.

We all have something to learn, it is a growing process.

(A/E) drove process and meetings mostly, not PP. Meetings every week with them – architect-driven and then different disciplines.

Yes to some extent, but there was a whole new group on each project.

### Question Type:  2. Process

#### 4. How do you initiate a capital project? (request the service)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Internally, it's based on our master plan, and based on identification of suitable donor to fund the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>It used to be to be with XXXX [former University president ], there was a more informal approval starting with the president because of the politics of the projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Send a service request in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>I don’t think you initiate. You submit the service request, and we determine the structure based on the scope of the work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It always seems to me to be somewhat of an arbitrary measure about how it becomes a capital project or not. Do Shawn and Monte get together and decide? -There’s a checklist of sorts, if multi-craft, etc.

Repeat customers know who to go to and which department to send it to. Either EAS, Telecom, main Phys Plant, and other ways of issuing it

The service request it received and goes to EAS Estimating for an estimate, then XXXX

For the status report, we send an e-mail to the customer saying “we received request for service, your project lead is XXX.

There is nowhere online where someone can see the status of their project. They receive a memo from EAS, but that is not the standard for other departments.

“For not knowing what we were doing, it’s really remarkable it’s turned out as good as it has.”

From very beginning, service requests, I cannot believe it is not an electronic form. We have to fax our service request –“which in this day and age is pathetic.” Get email to alert.

Basically put in service request and provide acct number to get paid.

We have to ID physical problems, then report, then follow up to be sure they got done.

Typically get no notice about M&R items getting done. Put in request and never know it’s done.

Clear word from XXXX shop was to control funding. More contact with XXXX in this area.

Deans, chairs, etc. all weigh in on needs and there’s that; then lots of things at play: politics at play and BOT support and; maintenance to keep on-campus buildings up and running.

Definition of roles and responsibilities...developing a sequence of who does what when and having it documented so everybody understands their roles.

Department gets an estimate from EAS. That then goes the college. College requests funding from the UJ, and when the project is started.

Developing a relationship with EAS has made the process better, - they understand the sequence and what information is required.

Developing good project programs because of the master plans

For example, the number of seats wanted and types of venues.

Have the money, then what: Show up at meetings.

Huge political decisions pushing development in southeastern Michigan. Various entities pushing for their groups to host the new buildings.

I collect the department signature(s) and walk the request to the Dean’s office, the Office of Planning and Budgets, and then drop the req off at the Phys Plant Engineering office. To be honest, I’ve only collected all in a single day once.

I think we need to get better at our programming statements as the client before meetings.

It's easy to file service request. But it is time consuming to get a response.
No, just showed up at a meeting and they were there. Don’t recall service request or contacting them at all.

Not much – create engaging environments – broad high level statements. (program statements)

On one occasion, a request was sent back to the department for additional details and was unfortunately filed by one of our clerks. It took several months to sort out the mystery and to get the project back on track.

Once we get “approval to get approval” it gets going.

Once a service request has been submitted, there is always a certain amount of anxiety and anticipation on where the paperwork is.

Part of U planning process that dean has with provost to discuss capital projects and XXXX (college) projects

Part of what we do is take that info and transfer it into a language with architects to be part of the team - if we had more time to do the programming and figure out what our client wants into a living document with more guidance.

Physical Plant usually suggests staff that will be on project.

Put in request for estimate. Faxing service requests to PP is pretty generic, and they determine where they go to. We will send to key shop or to telecom but others go to main number and they sort it out.

Put in service request for estimate or whatever, and then you get back an email about it being received and who is assigned to it.

Send the services request to the Physical Plant.

Service requests. You don’t know if go to Interior Design or to Phys Plant. Most of the time it has to go through the building folks. Confusing to know who to send to?

Talk to XXXX and he tells me to talk to XXXX

That would be us a client actually knowing what we want – having broad goals, so we are on the same page.

The core team gets assembled and has a kick off meeting and some level of roles and expectations needs to be developed.

The internal department head and customer works to develop the program and scope to include on the service request.

The macro level, at the end of the day/project what did we approve – lighting, accessibility, venues, seats.

The service request usually includes as much detailed information as possible; including demolition, room layout, dimensioned drawings, special equipment requests, power requirements, etc.

There are regular meetings to discuss what is coming up with dates and times – there is a comprehensive master plan that Dan and Brad are aware of.

There is pre-contact and collaboration so the initial process is going rather well. We have input regarding who is on the project and how the project should be initiated.

There should be clear ownership of processes and handoffs... who/what/when... and a clear picture of who should be making the decisions.

They have to sit around the table with 20 experts and have to figure out how to incorporate those things.
Think it’s clear that our planning group doesn’t even know how it got going or how parties got involved.

We talk with them about the best time to initiate a plan before it formalizes.

We want to retain as many rooms as possible (we know we are going to ruin a certain number of rooms).

XXXX (Dept. Rep.) asked to draw up money preformed part of it

XXXX (Dept. Rep) asks what is needed footprint wise to operate with students

### 4. What would you improve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>It is silly to have to fax a service request to Phys Plant, whereas telecom you don’t have to fax. Interior design is electronic as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>A lot of campus is in same place because of resources. There are less resources and things fall through the cracks as people are picking up other jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Approval to hire. “Authorization to Plan” has to change. Someone with power and authority needs to be able to OK schematic plan/cost, working through Physical Plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Because they have access to all buildings, PP can show up whenever they want and do work. Don’t ID themselves and no one knows they are there or what they’re doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Document lessons learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Example: We’d jump right into process and start at Physical Plant for Authorization to Plan, then they (Physical Plant) would do an estimate on cost/square foot and then we’d send a service request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>I Find frustration. I have a project now, it was started over a year ago, it can only be done in the summer – we kept going back to PP to get it handled and PP couldn’t give an update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>I had PO at Purchasing for four months. In that timeframe, our antiquated equipment was compromised and we had to pay big fines. PO’s should not sit for months and months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Interior Design – as far as I’m concerned “they are the absolute worst service in the world” I avoid them at all costs. Purchasing and interior Design have issues with each other and they won’t help the project because they don’t like each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>More an internal piece than paperwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Need better Communication/Collaboration of the budget earlier than final close out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Not sure there is an effective check and balance – need to make sure you are keeping on your budget. Sometimes it is a little artificial – I think it is a passive planning office instead of a proactive process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Not taking so long to close out -- I think it might be internal – contractors want their money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Phys Plant people are at our job and then get called away to other “more important” project, that happens more than once and gets frustrating. This came up recently – it went on and on – some due to weather, but lots due to being called away.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sometimes the leave sticky notes to let you know they are there. If my name is on requested work order they can contact me to let know the project status.

Sometimes they come in with service requests that make no sense, or go from memory and ask people in building to fill in blanks about where work is needed.

Sometimes they come in with service requests that make no sense, or go from memory and ask people in building to fill in blanks about where work is needed.

Taking another person to retype what I sent and then there are typing errors. “In this day and age, it is crazy.” - Its not very green with using paper too.

Tech side: Documentation/materials – as built, manuals, etc. are local.

The PP is fabulous for emergencies, but for scheduled work is where they seem to fall down. Some are three or four years old.

There are problems when you’re approved to spend $50K, then come back and realize it’s two times that. Sometimes you have to spend money to determine if you need to spend more.

There is no formal process to follow up if the KPI’s are met. This should include more than on time and under budget. Did we meet the objectives of why we invested the money?

They asked us what supplier was used before and PP couldn’t answer, then it turns out that company is out of business. We weren’t a priority because the thought was we had a year and a half. We put in a service request a year and a half ago.

They charge 4 hours for 10 minutes of work.

We feel like we are not important. People have six other projects going on besides yours.

We felt like we were put on backburner.

We need somebody to stay on top of project and makes sure it gets done in time allotted for. I know we got lots of emails about it.

We’re retrofitting where we can. We can’t knock out walls, etc. People who need to stay on top of these things, need to stay on top of them.

When people do customer call backs, they will call her b/c she is frequent requestor and she is supposed to answer for something she knows nothing about. Frustrating.

You should get some sort of feedback that it’s done or what the status is. We put in ten requests a week, maybe 10 in a day. I don’t want to have to follow up. I want the PP to let me know it’s done.

5. Can you walk us through your experience? - Estimating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>As for delivering projects, you’ll get “very few complaints from me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>We need to see more details than just the number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>I echo that. Need more detail there to understand costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>They look at project - Budget in case something goes wrong, whereas our budgets are what they are.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guy said forgot to add (equip) in the estimate. Then, it went (higher). He was rude and uncommunicative. So the program was cut and it took 8 months to get done. Cost came (higher)- had to go back to dean to ask for more money.

Estimate came to $XXX. Told we couldn’t afford and asked what it would cost to install X. I asked any economy of scale for reducing? He said nope, that was it. - requested and he said “no, we don’t share estimates, you wouldn’t understand it”

Almost w/o exception, if we get bid from outside contractor, it is significantly lower, concerned about that access b/c cant even get an estimate with detailed info or as-builts. Maybe, just the schedule and budget.

Don’t have opportunity to get outside estimates and check if it still the same and PP doesn’t tell you what’s in the estimate. I don’t do many types of plans.

Doesn’t sound like XXX produced budget.

If we can save money, we will save money – and it will get done when you want and how you want.

The initial numbers are highly conceptual and we really don’t have a clear view until we have a CM on board.

XXX’s team adds another layer of review – XXX saying we need to hire an estimator, but we already have people looking at it.

“Campus art is ridiculous.” I don’t mind a fee, but when it’s attached to every project, it’s ridiculous. Why don’t we pool money and pick key spots to place art to enhance the entire campus, but putting art on every project is a waste.

Maybe there should be a charge for estimating because that is a lot of work.

We do lots of estimating, but they are the lowest priority.

Some people want a detailed estimate to see where they can cut or do work themselves. -Tim clarification: So to defend against that, do we give only lump sum so they don’t try to do work on their own?

but I think we expect customers to know the difference between PCAs (preliminary cost estimates) and a real detailed estimate. It’s what we assume they understand.

PCA and estimate difference: Need to look at the forms to see how language is defined - ”Preliminary cost assessment” is the estimate?

The quote is what people expect to pay. Going back many years, we requested electrical outlets, and it came to $1,500 - outrageous, and then there was the question of are you going to for sure charge that or only what it costs to put it in?

XXXX (person) has no problem going back and asking for more money, but other departments don’t have that luxury because they have no more money. So couldn’t we fix how the University funds projects to those departments?

Estimates are traditionally high to account for unknowns

Can you charge for it if the costs are higher than the estimate? Answer - Yes, but it’s not pretty.

“it is a fine line to walk and you don’t want to box in the creative people – you have to give them enough leeway to find the best solution – it is hard for budget-driven people.”

All of the “add-ons” or fees are very frustrating. You can’t see what is being charged. Theres no Communication/Collaboration.
All these add ons ... you get a number from consultant for $10 million to build, then you tack on 20 to 30 percent for the actual project number. It’s ridiculous the things these projects have to fund on this campus.

All these fees get tossed in there. I finally learned to tack 30 percent on a project when I get an estimate from an architect. I know we need to pay some fees, but not all make sense and I don’t know what the charges are.

At a minimum you need the CM on board early, it would be beneficial to have the trades in early also.

At the end of the project there is no Communication/Collaboration of when the money is going to be given back – Who should be managing this? Who is the person managing cost control? There is no transparency.

Capital projects where we are working with the Phys Plant construction companies, that info is pretty accurate and available, it’s when you’re doing the $20,000 project that comes in at $35,000 that we don’t have any tracking.

Don’t value engineer things out unless the customer agrees.

Engineering firms are not sensitive to department financial needs. Most capital projects funded through the A and I process. Early budgets are what get’s funded before there is detail.

Estimates tend to be high. No one wants to run out of money on a project, but I think the numbers could be more concise.

Every department is going through and doing their piece – the Physical Plant is like the gate keeper to the campus.

Ex. New staffer and seasoned staffer: two great employees, but very confusing as to who’s doing what, whereas a more seasoned person can clarify roles

First you talk to the dean–there is a list of long range capital projects.

Fueled by XXX. Reliable and conservative. Always in under budget. College had revenue stream based on students and such factored in and rolled out over 20/30 years based on budgets.

I know lots of folks criticize EAS and Physical Plant at times, but I have no complaints. I’ve put them on schedules that were ridiculous and no projects have gone over budget.

I think it is a balance because they are supposed to be working together – we don’t know all of the conversations that are happening.

I think lots of departments circumvent the process to save money and avoid PP process, due to time and costs

I think through the design process we figure out the pricing and what good materials are and what will perform – if the estimate is under the client has a wish list usually.

I understand we need consistency for XXX Shop work, but is it included in the most efficient, economical way?

I want detail in the estimate: a scope of work, equipment needed - have spelled out what. I would like an estimate for labor and parts – we don’t know what percentage is labor or parts, the estimates are just lump sums.

If budget problems we resolve them quickly, efficiently, and effectively and leadership has been excellent. Consultants, too, and EAS guidance on those has been excellent.

If budget problems we resolve them quickly, efficiently, and effectively and leadership has been excellent. Consultants, too, and EAS guidance on those has been excellent.
If we are saying we have $15 mil, we have $15 mil all in – sometimes it seems to get lost in translation and they design a more expensive project. "We would save so much money if people would just listen."

In my opinion, it’s the market, if the market turns around watch out.

Increase the opportunity to communicate options.

Is there a standard overhead structure at PP? Fees?

It is hard to show people a more expensive project because their expectations are then higher.

It seemed XXX handed it over to XXX.

It’s interesting when we get estimates that are way too high, and then we go back to PP and they are able to take all sorts of things out to revise, and it’s like “cool, but why didn’t you think of that before you wasted all of our time?”

JIT is a big issue on capital projects.

Leadership piece = a gray area.

Market at the time we got a very good deal. Got better prices than we would if Detroit ramps back up.

My experience has been “pretty darn good” – there was only one project where it was over by a substantial amount.

Not critical of any one person.

Not enough Communication/Collaboration of where money is being spent.

One project was estimated at $$$$ and has gone to over double, we added some but it doubled from the original scope. Didn’t get work sheets to see the overhead. Internal est. sheet- MSU adds about 40% on top.

Performance went through second iteration and “slashed and burned” to keep under budget with what BOT approved.

Physical Plant Key Shop: I understand we need consistency for Key Shop work, but is it included in the most efficient, economical way?

Physical Plant Landscape Services: What are you planting? They always seem to overplant buildings based on what resources we have to maintain them. We are taking landscaping out because we don’t have the manpower to maintain it.

Physical Plant staffing: Physical Plant is challenged staffing wise. Can they do it with normal staffing or will they be charging overtime?

Physical Plant XXXX: I don’t have a choice (to use them) ... but is it competitive? Are you the most economical, efficient, effective?

Physical Plant XXXX: What are you doing? They always seem to over design based on what resources we have to maintain them. We are taking plants out because we don’t have the manpower to maintain it.

PP has been good about adding more value to project if the estimator works well with department. Electrical has been very good to work with.
Preliminary Cost Assessments (PCAs) have been accurate, too, from EAS (Engineering and Architectural Services) prior to formal consultant

Pretty good. Not much slippage in these areas, as much as XXX can recall.

Programming – did that internally or how?

Reliable estimates from XXX. (EAS)

Shops line item: It’s not clear to me what’s in there. Right now we’re getting overtime charged on project costs from Shops and we’re looking at that.

So, we get high estimates, but then they show they could have kept it down. – but you have to initiate that conversation.

Some other people don’t necessarily understand it.

Some projects are mandated out of the plan.

Sometimes politics get in the way. At Administration we had to put in elevators that weren’t in the plan.

Started “running up the ant hill” and got approval from board.

The estimate is not very detailed.

The estimate is way too high, in my experience, and then no details. We will ask the PP and then we will go straight to contractors to compare costs and determine who to go with. I choose the best route, “and then I fight the battle.”

The estimates are very crude and don’t have enough detail. There is very little dialogue for give and take to understand how the project can come under budget.

The long range capital planning committee evaluates when you have a business need and the board makes the final decision.

The Physical Plant does something with breaking down buildings and analyzing. It’s really cool to see that process. “They’re like the gatekeepers of campus.”

The process – I sat in one conversation about XXXX and thought it was cool and impressive how they figured it out and made cuts together.

The rest of the estimates have been good, with good guidance by Physical Plant. Consultants and Physical Plant have been pretty solid.

The XX on board early helps us in our decision making and allows us to plan our investment in the project better to attain best value

There are so many building needs, but we focus first on certain areas and recognize we can’t touch certain areas.

There are so many things that the buildings need and we are usually only focusing on one area and there is always a “if there was more money we would…”

There is always a list of things that need to be done that aren’t going to happen.

There’s no Communication/Collaboration about the needs or requirements. They don’t give out detailed worksheets. It’s frustrating. It’s not a secret. Every single change not enough detail. We are told they don’t release the detailed numbers.
To customer/bigger picture = no, not clear if there’s a department specialist

Very disappointed and frustrated with EAS PMs. Would like to put in more trust in outside staff. One estimate was $$$ which went to the board, adding 1 year, then the A/E firm said it was over 50% high. Came in over 20% below the orig. est.

Very undefined results.

We are committed to making sure spaces really work for people while some other schools just do the bare minimum.

We are committed to sprinkling the building, so they cut that from the other project in the building.

We built a $16 million XXX that wasn’t in the plan.

We have a revenue stream – funds are earmarked for the staffing and what have.

We have had an estimate and project came out over budget. It was higher than the estimate and we had to pay for the overage. We will tell PP to “go high” on estimates so we don’t get put into that situation.

We love it, but there is no more money.

We make decisions were we are going to spend our money when we are doing initial specification between estimating and design.

We need more accurate estimates. There’s too much change from the design estimate to the bids. It could kill the project if it’s too high.

We needed painting. The phys plant estimate was way high. Went to others and got other estimates for almost 1/3 the cost. So, we called PP and told them we wanted to go outside - it took some work to get them to agree.

We typically go in with the budget and usually looking for validation when we see the first estimate.

We will bid alternates and then if there is extra money that is how we will spend.

What about classroom space and such? There was already a very detailed shell with this information. Big budget buckets then did not really get adjusted from there.

What about smaller projects?

When we are about to submit our annual requests, PP comes and gives us an est., and that figure goes into the request to the dean’s office. Probably not the most cost-efficient way to operate, because the estimate is short on details.

Window AC costs about $2000 for a $500 unit. They charge for the estimate if you go forward for the project.

Works fine. Check box for needed estimate.

XXX effort where high-impact users got together to discuss widgets/rooms/specifics of space and that was replicated across sites.

XXX produced construction budget; and we at college did all the rest of the expenses, but XXX had good estimate for big bucket items as far as technology.

XXX was really the group that did the estimate, we had to engage XXXX to cut down the program to fit the budget.
Yes, at that point it is the maximum spend and the team understands that – maybe once this market turns around it could be a whole different story.

You get a number for construction for $10 million to build, then tack on 20-30% for project - all these fees tossed in there

You go in with $16 and end up with $8 in construction costs.

You wouldn’t know you are coming in under budget after estimating it down and all of the processes.

6. Can you walk us through your experience? - Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Value Engineering needs to occur with the customer in the room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Assume history of dealing with academic units that came way out of line from budgets so drawing on past experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>Back to space comment – why not have enough space? Could you have built more space or was space allotment fixed by facility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>Big jobs impacted by experience of outside design firm and the individual MSU project managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Changing doors for modifying lab and then some issues with moving too far and moving back and that was a “fun adventure.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>People think we’re slow because it is EAS, they don’t understand the process that ties our hand. The campus community needs to be educated about the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Abbreviate the timeline. Service Req to work done. (April - serv req sent, need est.to reno. for researchers who will start in fall. May, get a note from Estimator. Designers only now looking at rooms. Reviewed at least 3 times with estimator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>Six weeks later got the designer and have to go through entire process with designers. I’m not the researcher. Four months/six months later, I won’t remember all the details, so have to pull back the researcher in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Now work not done until first of year and have researcher who needs space now. Asked designers how to abbreviate this, estimators told to avoid estimating step. As client, that is not acceptable. “Want us to just hand over our wallet.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>-estimator doing a poor job. Then, he brings in control grp. to analyze. “Course, I had to pay for that” PP ordered incorrectly. Meet PM again- frustration with estimators and design staff. “I really ragged on him and told him how I wasn’t happy.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>As builds. We don’t seem to give a rat about these. No one verifies them.” Nobody can believe what the as-builds are. “Virtually every project I run into, as builds are horrible.” Sure would be nice to be somewhat reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>Before (EAS Design)- we had big fight as he was going by code and I was going by safety and he wouldn’t budge on it. He then went by the code and made an unsafe environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Involved in skire process with designers. Some very thorough, some very vague – do just enough to say have done their jobs. They don’t understand how that info is pulled and used to report, various other purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Everything: completion dates, estimate changes, inaccurate planning throughout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 385 | For BOT projects, big S admin (Fred, Kathy, president), etc. – use this data to feed these folks. Political implications. Resolutions may be wrong to BOT and then have to circle around.
I don’t think anyone tells you up front that it’s going to take this long so the customer has the expectation.

If PP was staffed for the peaks we’d be ready to jump on it. I don’t know if it’s been compared, but my workload based on others like me at U of M is not comparable.

Very little design is done in-house, but we still have to give consultants guidance and input.

We need to find out customers’ move-in dates and then move backwards and then find out how much time you have.

This happens all the time that we make it happen. “If someone has to get something done in a set timeframe, we do it. If everything was actually first in, first out, it would be a very different experience for customers.”

The design for our space has come along, but we haven’t been involved. Nothing formal.

Thinking of Steve Jobs. He made things that work, and had people that make things work. All customers want is to get the job done. The thing is why not have a liaison/ombudsman for building projects instead of submitting service request?

They submit to ombudsman so there’s a person the customer can contact (who’s not an engineer, not a whatever), but a person who can give them all the upfront info and know the questions to ask - Like a patient advocate

Back to ombudsman idea – I’m building a house. If I had a person who advocated for the customer... It would have to be someone who knew in the University, etc. This is exactly what a PM project manager) is supposed to do.

My husband works on campus. Whensomething needs to be done, he just says to call ‘the Physical Plant.’ They don’t differentiate departments or estimates, need to look at doing things the same? Customers call us all ‘the Physical Plant’

If I send something to ‘Physical Plant’ to get estimate and I’m getting different responses (PCAs, estimates, whatever it’s called in different departments) back from different departments it’s confusing to me.

Different priorities for different cust., hard trying to meet expectations-not going to scold customers who aren’t good (Cust.) How to handle those who are poor planners? To help set timeframes and then a precedent for future projects?

A small person doesn’t get the customer service big customers get, so big customers probably like us and smaller customers probably don’t like us.

We get recognized for big projects, like Athletics, but someone suffers.

PM is lead from design through a certain point. Handoffs to construction PM. - decide based on workload and specialists. It’s different on individual projects.

There are different ways. It starts with a design representative, and then a construction representative. There are only a few cases where there is a PM from start to end.

Chronic problem to not have outlets for online testing, etc

Construction management firms have been excellent, too

Depending on the people on the project the process is really good or not good – the process doesn’t support all of the various personalities working.

Depends on the team you get assigned. The difference between good and bad: Listening and understanding needs of customer. I’ve had A/E’s tell me what is needed (make assumptions) before really listening to the needs of the customer.
406 Did it locally in her space with staff and not XXX like XXX needed to do b/c didn’t have the staff to do that.

407 Did XXX have any involvement? None. Part of black hole at XXXX – asked them about this and nothing.

408 Didn’t build out enough space; have real issue with lack of office space for faculty. Making it work. But everything works so far.

409 EAS has been very flexible – giving us opportunities to make choices.

410 For XXXX (certain project), not all the right people were in the right room at the right time and now changes will need to happen.

411 He weighed in on different MSU standards that he brought out to these sites. “He did fight for them.”

412 I like being involved in the A/E selection process.

413 I really like the score cards on construction sites. No one wanted to get a bad grade. It helped Communication/Collaboration and keep people moving.

414 I’ve never been a part of the A/E selection. I don’t think there is any accountability if it’s wrong.

415 If you haven’t gone through the A/E selection need prepping for what to look for. We get huge folders of 15-20 A/Es and can’t really gauge. We get a scoresheet. It gets real confusing - there are different consultants for different project parts.

416 In many of the food projects we start with design where we invite all the people who it will affect and need to have a say – then seek out individuals that didn’t come.

417 It doesn’t always happen.

418 It’s a good selection process – we are encouraged to provide input.

419 Lack electrical outlets in building. Laptops, needed, for example – student laptops in classrooms and other b/c no outlets – have had to fashion together some power strips.

420 No complaints about design process.

421 Not enough advice, over-engineered and badly engineered

422 One thing with design we have gotten support from Physical Plant is when there are stakeholder meetings and getting input from different members – building relationships and helping others understand what to do and why. Phys Plant projec

423 Our large (Specific projects) have gone to the same firm. Due to their knowledge about (our projects) design reviews tend to have short turnaround times. They tend to already have a good idea what our renovations will require.

424 Our small projects have been designed by MSU EAS. I have been very pleased with our designs.

425 Sat around room multiple times with XXX, us, PP, and various constituents going room by room to determine what needed and “got more and more into the weeds.”

426 Screens, seating, lighting, and bringing in the right people to get their input on spaces.

427 Some of the things that are installed to save energy don’t seem to work.
The Communication/Collaboration is very positive during the design and this allows the project team to communicate progress to the heads of department.

The designers are listening to us instead of telling us what they are designing.

The designers are very willing to work with us.

The Physical Plant were the determining voices, how many seats, etc. We had to challenged some of the decisions.

The space needs were needed, but not affordable.

There is not enough interaction/Communication/Collaboration. The Faculty are not experts so they cannot critique the design. Only when things are grossly off can they tell.

There really wasn’t accurate layouts of the buildings that exist.

There wasn’t really a good programming questionnaire or checklist.

Thought some standards were too elaborate (size of conduit), but not sure what drove all those things based on how have to keep MSU buildings operational.

Truly, this whole expansion is unique b/c remote dealing with different entities. Maybe part of this is developing a procedure for dealing with tenant-based systems vs. things we own. Not controlled by the University.

Value analysis should be done earlier in the job and not just when we are over budget. Value analysis should include the entire group and not just the EAS team.

We are getting to know the smaller projects better so it has really been good when we use the in-house services for construction. We have good Communication/Collaboration when we do.

We don’t know about the A/E selection... We were given a score sheet. If you have never done this before, the scorecard process is just odd. Not done at right time – we couldn’t answer questions.

We don’t know where to start getting the information – had to figure it out alone – is there a way to figure it out for Physical Plant – we need something simple to locate people. We end up calling the XXX or PP main number to find the right person.

We get approvals. We have time constraints. We get approvals late. But some people have the flexibility. Most of the Shops guys understand. They try to build in enough time to get stuff done.

We had one experience with interior design and that was positive.

We leave it up to EAS to determine whether to do all in-house or outside and it has worked well.

We thought the standards were too elaborate.

We were told that moveable equipment is cheaper to just buy ourselves.

What was role of XXX design staff? Always there and looking out for MSU interests, but not leading the charge. When he perceived MSU interests not being met, he was a bulldog at times.

What do you consider the design?
449 What would that training include and work to tell who needs to be spoken to for each specific project?

450 When the Physical Plant looks at us as a division it is confusing – we are so far away and they don’t have a way to know who we are. Is there an advantage to people knowing each other?

451 When we finally got involved the shell and footprint had already been decided.

452 With bigger projects, we interview 3-4 consultants. We sit in and our input is weighed heavily. Usually all are in the same boat to make decision

453 With in house design it depends on who you get, some understand a quicker timeline and some work at their own pace.

454 With in house design it’s not going as fast as we would like

455 Worked in conjunction with XXX, XXX, others to create strong backbone and redundancy.

456 XXX and our tenants determining voices in this process.

457 XXX as vendor to make all the design decisions locally to determine fabrics, carpet, tables, etc.

458 XXX is gaining a knowledge of the needs of our department and the design is reflecting that.

7. Can you walk us through your experience? - Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>If it is more than finishes and fixtures we contact XXX – it depends on how complex the project is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>The construction rep said “if you need me I will be involved” – it was really more a technology job and it was being done by the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Working with (const. rep) was harder because we are a more of a technology driven department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>A detailed budget wasn’t there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>“I had waves of terror – never knew what was going on totally.” It was a train that moved and all turned out good, but never a detailed budget – not sure if should have been, but had angst about that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>A project that had a temp. fix. We had to call the PP to remind them and they pointed out different PP Depts that were “supposed to have done it” – it finally got done, but we had to remind them and work out who had the assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>About 250,000 and up go through (FPSM).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>Always based on who the project managers are – some are great at getting notes and some aren’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>Bid process creates some issues too. If we go with the low bid we get what we get, which is why I’ve become a fan of CM (construction management) over the years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comm. went to local level. Felt disconnect from budget office when it moved into construction – not sure if just him having hard time letting go, or normal maturation of project or whatever, but felt disconnect.

Construction phase is going well. Undefined roles of numerous project managers is a negative.

EAS people are doing their due diligence on expectations and what needs to be delivered on our projects.

Felt fire marshal piece could have been done earlier – was something missed by XXX. Had to wait signify tie to get that feedback and had unmovable deadline.

For a new elevator, the first year we had to call the contractor ourselves. PP wouldn’t provide service. Note I do love PP, I don’t want to come across as being anti-PP, they do wonderful job. It is just odd that a customer has to call contractor.

Good Communication/Collaboration because department can talk directly to the construction rep or field project manager.

Good Communication/Collaboration of risks if there is a problem.

PP wants to do everything on overtime when we’re not around. Estimate is always high. They put people to work at 6.00am in the morning and always work overtime. - I don’t want people in my work area (lab) during off hours.

Depending on the nature, sometime off hours is preferred. We have to schedule due to classrooms/students. Need to discuss communicate and schedule.

Communication/Collaborations notices. They send one notice and we have to revise it so it’s something pertinent and easy to read. Have to go through ¾ of the way to understand what the message is.

It gets posted the day before. Early notices are good, but the occupants have to get the message. The message PP is trying to convey is not clear. On steam tunnel notice, but real message is “can’t use parking lot” – but no one mentioned that.

In short, Notices that make perfect sense to PP, doesn’t make any sense to the client.

Process is extraordinarily long. (project) took (long). I had (project) that took only (shorter), years back. In other case, (prefab) was already made and just had to be attached. It cost way more than the work. As the process takes time, we always put th

If PP can’t do it, outside construction group can do it. But, some of the physical employees like XXXX Planner Analyst is good. If we don’t give a due date, it can’t be done.

You have to monitor and stay on these projects. We’ve been saved by the installer on many of these projects. Ex> re: almost replacing project door with the same type door (skilled trades representative who came to install job).

Have demanded schedules and get minimal. Then recognize (if it will meet) and deal with it—that’s when run into problems and hear “we don’t have enough people … quite frankly, I don’t care, I need this job done, so how can we accomplish this goal”

Good for mowing, snow removal, etc. Prices are higher than what someone else could do, but look at that as lesser than two evils if I have budget there – then at least using them and that buys you favors and can horse-trade.

Good updates are given regarding construction progress

Good updates for information. The projects have always met the substantial completion dates.
Had weekly job meetings that dean attended. In touch with daily. Dean very involved b/c he was here. XXX and XXX talked multiple times daily. XXX attended weekly meetings too and worked well with contractors.

Hospital space and educations space = the “pickle” – this was late in the game.

I think change orders are my responsibility. The better I am during design, the more I limit change orders. It’s team-oriented – the more we can do on front end, the less on the back end. The better the consultant, the better off you’ll be.

I think they have come a long way.

I understand change orders and the need for them, but many people don’t understand because they are never involved in projects, We are going to have change orders, that’s why we have contingencies

I would speed up the submittal process

If you call PP number and talk to one of operators, they’ll give you the supervisor right way. If you state the nature of the problem (HVAC, etc.)

It seems we are always trying to get to bottom of why work is not being done on time. Was it a result of lack of Communication/Collaboration in Phys Plant between departments determining who had it assigned and who was going to get it done?

It’s the responsibility of the customer to immerse them self in and study drawings and know contractors. The project representative can’t catch everything, so you can save money and time by immersing yourself in a project.

Kickoff meetings always very structured.

Lots of interaction with XXXX (EAS)

My biggest pet peeve w/ PP is calling someone to come in and look at something and you don’t know they came, don’t know what they did, and don’t know if it’s done. You get no feedback that it was completed.

Never good luck with Interior Design. It takes them forever and things aren’t done with quality and they never come back to check to see how the project turned out.

Never had to push through door. People we work with are great.

OK, I understand issues, BUT then the day came when it was really needed and it wasn’t functional. It had been another misCommunication/Collaboration. So we had to put a backup plan in place, so we ended up having to call a contractor.

On XXXX the process is a little bit different.

Once our projects start, it goes good. They are on time and it’s done, so no problems once it gets started.

One of the biggest struggles is getting appointments with the right people.

Physical Plant does a great job managing safety, security, Communication/Collaborations with outages. When you have people living to or adjacent to these projects it makes a difference to always know what is happening.
Pre-bid meetings and kick-off are solid; construction meetings excellent; we are kept up to speed; they keep schedules updated

Reps do a great job bringing contractors on board and understanding our needs

Schedule and budget are most important to us.

Talked budget every week, but b/c no cost to MSU and know under budget, but big budget scares when state fire marshal piece happened. Still met budget, but that was big unanticipated expense.

The construction rep said if you need me I will be involved – it was really more a technology job and it was being done by the department

The end result is generally positive because there are good people who are willing to fill the gaps.

The reality was there was not a lot of help with temporary facilities

The two hour fire-rating caused a major challenge with the state fire marshal. We had to make some changes to accommodate this.

There was a bit of a disconnect, we never felt the budget was clear.

There was lots of interaction with the construction rep, which was helpful

There were bi-weekly meetings. The MSU construction rep was the lead.

They work well with keeping dates in front of them.

Too many people with overlapping roles... how can we maximize these peoples time?

We finally had someone from Phys Plant over, and it got figured out and done. We had to take it to someone at central Administration to get it done. If this were Athletics, would this be tolerated? We were very pleased it got done.

We had to do work to make our building ADA accessible. It was embarrassing because there were two meetings where it was supposed to be demonstrated and it wasn’t done.

We had weekly construction meetings and that was great

We have a lot of fast paced projects and they get them done – once it gets to construction it usually goes really well.

We have to dig up the email that says service request was received, follow up with the persons assigned and then they respond in the next day. It’s like you have to remind them they have the jobs.

We just started using Skire.

We knew what we were in for. There were regular meetings during the construction phase. Regular meetings are very important to success of project.

We know who is in charge.

We should get better financial updates during progress. How is the money being spent?
We typically have owners meetings and EAS is very flexible – no one from our department attends meeting with subs anymore.

We use Famis and it makes a big difference in purchasing the furniture – it is a much more seamless process. With Skire we just started using it and I think I now have it figured out – I appreciate it because it means we all don’t have to be standing in t

Went fine. When there’s an issue, we called the contractor and they got in to handle it. For post-construction problems we either call the PP or call the contractor directly.

With Dave’s area, we implemented biweekly recurring meetings to discuss progress. That helped A LOT.”

You would be hard-pressed to find a construction representative who didn’t have biweekly or weekly meetings. I have weekly meetings.

Who is invited to the meetings - When it is for full-service AE, they are at those meetings.

For smaller projects the designers are not always invited to construction meetings and vice versa. It’s a construction representative to designer issue as far as who is invited to progress meetings.

At the kickoff meeting, we set time for recurring meetings and establish who will be there.

When PP people come in (when they do), they are great and I have no complaints about them, but it seems you always have to remember to follow up with them before they will come to complete the task.

Who do we hold accountable? We go to project manager.

Will there be a status report of service requests? Is that new system has built in EBSP.

Working with ATS was harder because we are a more of a technology driven department.

Waste of money, ex. Lights continued to go off with sensor. Over two years. Every time sent a diff person out to troubleshoot. No one researches. They all came up with the same idea.

Know really knowledge-base/education, something to reference to say “CC has called 15 times on this.” No historical data base to reference. Way it is now, “it seems like we’re wasting a lot of money.”

8. Can you walk us through your experience - Close Out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>All projects have been on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>Are the Physical Plant departments held to the same accountability as the contractor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>Construction side: had to do closeout with fire marshal and done locally – have on-site facilities manager there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>Drags on way too long - Always gets to us on time, but wrapping it up is like pulling teeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>Each site had construction-specific closeout and then separate AV./tech closeout. – both are done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Getting accounts shut off is impossible.

Having more frequent meetings towards the end of the project – any stakeholder who wants to be there should be invited.

I don’t want to be critical because we don’t walk in their shoes – if it’s bureaucracy or under-staffing, but it is a HUGE problem.

I like the idea that people keep in great contact post-close out, one rep still contacts us once a month to make sure everything is OK. That’s awesome.

I think over the last year it has improved.

I think that if a project is under budget the phys plant takes more overhead.

I would really like a roadmap – who is supposed to be doing what/when.

If EAS overseas projects, why not oversee to close them? It’s breaking down some place.

$1400 charge goes to our money guys, but it does not say “who, what, when, where, why” – have no idea what the charges are for. - when you ask about it, they send screenshot of FAMIS and expect that they will know what that is.

Billings with open orders “Horrible.” “No documentation about what was actually performed. Are told b/c supposed to be quick fix, but hard to recall in a year what money spent on when no documentation.

Five months later you get a call asking “how did we do on the project”? By then, I don’t even remember what the project was. So the whole system from beginning to end needs a change.

XXXX Building had to call PP to come and clean up space again. Once hollering about it, PP had outside firm come to do the work if couldn’t get to it, but why couldn’t that have happened before I had to start hollering.

I always ask what we can do from our end to abbreviate the process.

Unresolved issue- (project) complete last (year)-still not done. When ask (proj rep), response is “GC guys busy at other MSU jobs and can’t get to mine” I don’t give a damn b/c this project should be(finished). How bout we finish 1 job before starting oth

Aside: “Don’t like handoffs between project reps either. Don’t like that at all.”

You are the one that had to bird-dog it, not PP.” When snow flies, these guys are going to freeze again.

Need to hold back money to handle those things or something.

We end up closing jobs when 95% done. Still have room not operational that was “done” 1½ years ago. They got the lowest bidders. The (project) never met perf. requirements. Not being charged for work now b/c was never fixed.

Both physical labor done and the charges are done hitting. We get a call afterward. At that point, I don’t know for what the call is coming from.

There is NO follow up to say that project is done. Need to hear from PP that it’s done. We don’t even go through the Punch list. I need you guys to tell me when you are done. Both physical labor and financial part.
It should be done when customer says it’s done, not when PP says it is. When PM says certain parts are done.

I don’t know when call comes in to say closeout is done, but it’s way later in the process.

Cost comparatively for gravel and others tuff in bulk, LS can’t compete. “IT’s like everyone forgets it all MSU money. When budgets get tight, people put their arms around what’s theirs. How do you remind that it’s all MSU’s money.”

If someone has idea to farm some of these things out, I would recommend otherwise. MSU people take great pride in what they do. If we ever lost that it would be bad. People who build buildings care, MSU people care about MSU

It is almost nonexistent.

Most of us are on to the next thing.

Need clear view of what is being spent and forecasts

One year is reasonable depending on size of project

Paperwork is ridiculously slow. We closed out one project and years after it was done and got a huge charge to the project. I’m paying a fee for that?

Problem because the money is held too long. Why is it held so long and why can’t RHS get an update regarding the budget at substantial completion.

Punchlists are done for bigger projects and that’s nice.

Shops will come and finish jobs because contractor won’t. Punch list takes forever.

Someone needs to come back after a year. We need a six-month and 12-month review.

Sometimes the overhead seems very high if an estimate comes in higher than bids, but it’s not my money, so I don’t get too concerned about it.

Still expanding, so not closed out. Still morphing and revamping proformas. Have 20 and 30-year leases done.

Still figuring out the cleaning.

Takes too long before we see charges. We have to reconcile and we’re told it’s because payroll. I can’t forgive not having a close estimate – we can do it with our labor, so why not for custodial staff.

The big thing was the technology was unproven/untested.

The charges to account impact and the funds are not returned to the departments.

There isn’t any unless we ask for it – we have to push it.

There just continues to be charges to the account. It’s a “Nightmare” and it takes way too long for reasons that are not clear to me. 18 months and charges are still hitting the budget.

Took one year to get operation manuals.
We already had the extra money spent before the closeout.

Nothing in lab is paid for by PP – that’s expense to dept. “And then of course we pay 53.5% overhead.”

We are not communicated with once it leaves EAS. When handed off to administration, we’re out of the loop. I don’t know why there’s the breakdown. If EAS overseas projects, why not oversee to close them? It’s breaking down some place.

We can order a truck to move things around campus and one day it’s $100 and the other day its $500. We are told it’s different employees/different pay scales. It’s frustrating to see major discrepancies in the cost of the moving services.

We are trying to put procedures in place to make this consistent. We are working with reps to make sure they get documents needed at this point. We are working on procedures to make sure documents get where they are needed.

XXX (person) walked through whole punch-list with me and that was very valuable.

The customer thinks the project is closed out, and then they still keep getting charges to their accounts.

Of all the areas we discussed today, there’s a vast amount of improvement that can occur here (closeout), time-wise. The project reps need to hold the contractor’s feet to fire to get documents done, close out, get punch-list items done.

CPA moving projects from one phase to proper phase. You can’t close a work order until it is billed, and only bill once a month and then follow up. Need to notify the reps that work orders close so reps know and can close and take the right action.

Contingency? There is an academic difference between RHS and Athletics. Academics have no access to funds unless XXX.

We do a final deep clean, but need the extra help. The expectations are very high for residents moving in.

We don’t know when it’s done. It’s just assumed after awhile. It looks like it’s done, so we assume it’s done. It might be nice to get a check-off list from PP that it’s done from their perspective.

We own some of the problems with the Communication/Collaboration.

When we are in the project and utilizing the PIAs and then the real numbers aren’t matching we have taken to not fully funding and then there is some confusion about getting money back to people.

When we do a walk-through, it’s almost too early. They should come back again. We don’t know the problems until we have lived there awhile … and then we need follow up later.

**Let’s talk about different roles throughout the process. Was it clear what you were required to do?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>99.9% of people are good and doing best they can, but MSU Way team can define and help determine roles and process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>A lot of time the question comes up “Who has the final say?” – all teams have different roles but it isn’t all the way through a process – if it internally more clearly defined it would make it better for us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Getting accounts shut off at Phys Plant seemed like an impossible thing. Wouldn’t stop using the 3XXX account and transfer to 21 account. Little gating but graded on me. Don’t like red-line account, b/c people ping you for that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good coordination of effort? Yes. Seemed to know each other and who to contact.

I am not sure who is running our project from the Physical Plant.

I’m concerned with the bureaucracy that continues to be loaded on to different levels of campus. It has really affected EAS. Paperwork, reports.

If your role was one thing on one project, the next project the roles could change. You have to ask the questions to figure who is doing what – we always ask the same questions.

It depends on the project whether we have to contact different entities, but so long as you know the lead person at the PP, then it can get done.

It seems like we are starting to get there.

On our bigger project it was.

One example is – the Hubbard project we had to build an art case – the Physical Plant or an outside contractor? Physical Plant decided who the work was going to, made choice on work based on time.

Problem may have been us vs. Phys Plant b/c we aren’t used to doing this.

Team has tendency to fill gaps, but whether that’s appropriate/best way vs. strategic, streamlined ...

This has been mentioned numerous times. It’s positive that we have good people who fill the gaps but performance could be overall improved with a better defined plan or division of responsibilities.

This is a big place already with less people to do more. Increasing bureaucracy hinders people’s ability to do job if their attitudes toward them. We’re peeling back layers, but it’s like the onion keeps getting bigger and bigger.

Was clear who was doing what as well.

We do the project and have to find roles, but not everybody follows – we do it to ourselves.

Not sure it’s clear. “It depends on the personalities of the people what you might have to do and your job” Whether it’s workload or personalities – don’t know – it’s a reality. The same is true for design to construction and construction to design staff.

Is there a clear-cut designing manual that lays out our specific roles and who does them? I don’t think so.

No, for the first project it was not clear, the second project was better because I knew... -assumed that once the capital project service req is issued that the different service req for the capital proj would be done by the capital project, not the custo

You have to set up different service requests for Telecom. Also I didn’t know where to look to find out where the budget was. I had to make my own Excel document for the project.”

Need who, what, when, where, why. Need to know what being charged for. - “Hear A LOT about overhead.”

I put all responsibility on customer. PP will do what we want; we have to tell them what to do. ???
Don’t think need professional team devoted to my type building; don’t mind teaching PM what I need from them. They tell me what they need from me. As long as they know process, we can educate them to our particulars.

Hours tracking is not clear. Put on billables, if two people are needed per XXXX standards (again, another way to explain costs.), then maybe explain that.

It was remarkable how many times we would ask how much money had been spent and how there was not a clear answer to this.”

Q - Why were you trying to manage the budget? - answer Because I had to stay within the budget.

If FPSM is managing contingency, the customer gets nothing back.

We have taken some steps in this area too far are bogging down people. Some reports and paperwork have nothing to do with the job or getting us closer to the goal.

Weakest on our larger project was ATS with follow through and timeliness of service that was established. We would always ask who was doing what. If I wouldn’t have asked and done anything, it might not have turned out as well.

Yes, think so.

**Question Type: 3. General Performance**

**Did you identify key performance indicators and were they met? (schedule, budget, yes – but more about awards, grants, more students – what your project NEED was)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>I think we need to get better at our programming statements as the client before meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>Budget, schedule, quality = usually met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>Admit students long before they show up, so timeline gets interesting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>We’ve found that contingencies are planned to use as part of budget. We don’t know if contingency is being used b/c it’s needed (?), or if it’s just being used up. PP sees it as theirs to spend, not as real contingency or something LM could use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>Get staff into the natural light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>Go to peers and they can’t believe we make the deadlines that we do – it is almost like they aren’t sitting at the table – they don’t have a voice at the table and we do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>Happy students, budget, timeline (bringing in revenue, on timeline, bringing in studs – so all have been met)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>I try to push that in project, but it’s not always for me to drive. So that and Communication/Collaboration get pushed aside. KPI consistently got pushed off the table. A process should be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>It functions and revenue is being generated- also budget and schedule goals were met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most synchronous education happening in the continent/world.

Tech requirements working and that’s important.

The enrollment – the reality is you admit students far ahead of when they show up.

The Phys Plant should develop the process, request metrics and document if people/customers don’t participate.

We are more reactive than proactive in this department, and we need to be more proactive. Often times we don’t know the key point before almost failing on it.

We need to do this by standardizing.

They are not always just for our department to decide. There are numerous stakeholders involved and the project leads should make sure there is a clear picture of all stakeholder goals or KPI’s.

We are very fortunate to have our relationship with Physical Plant – some colleagues are left high and dry – we have never missed one of those deadlines.

Yes, we needed basic safety and security.

Yes. Enhance the experience

### If you had a choice, would you seek capital project services outside the university? Why or why not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>Are they pricing things so high for little projects so we don’t come to them and do it ourselves or what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>For little projects to go outside, I would love to -air conditioners, bulletin boards, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>How do you go off-campus? We are told we can’t go off campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658</td>
<td>I believe all of the counterparts are trying to make the process better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659</td>
<td>Used to be a time they would encourage you to go look at other operations and if you could prove that better deal was outside PP, then you could do that.” Not like that anymore – doesn’t seem to be a price check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>I have been told by operations for painting that it’s OK to do our own small paint jobs because they are all overworked and can’t get to them all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>I have been told by operations for painting that it’s OK to do our own small paint jobs because they are all overworked and can’t get to them all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>In order to maintain integrity and standards the University has in place, the end result is to work with the Phys Plant and not circumvent the process, “but will I go out and look for someone who can do it a whole lot less expensively, yes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663</td>
<td>It would cost us more outside and they don’t have a vested interested in the campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we pay for is extraordinarily high. We put in service req. and Purchasing intercepted and said had to use PP. Already had an outsider on board. $(low) est. from outsider, much higher from PP with no explanation. Didn't use PP and was lower.

Young professor got two bids from outside contractors to get work done for $( $$) and Phys Plant price tag was over double – so young professor is penalized for looking outside. These are examples form past couple years.

Higher fees reasons: “Think it’s project management fees, contingency fees, etc.”

MOB says PP must be involved if utilities are involved. We follow the books. I am a person who likes turnkey more. We have more lab alterations and maintenance.

All buildings should be built through Phys Plant. Bad for me, but that is where all building projects should be. But need to be responsive to costs, standards, timelines, budgets, etc.) (If we met their needs, they would want us to do the work).

And also expertise wasn’t there. People didn’t like what they’re seeing as far as projects completed by PP. Now Land Management does everything design-build

Would like to - List preferred vendors whose work is trusted/follow MSU Specs for pricing and make choice from those. “I could have Mgd. project faster/efficient than PP person and less expensively.” “Would use outside parties every time.”

Witnessed it. Much more accountability and dedication and Communication/Collaboration from outside union workers on the job. Productivity here is less than in private sectors. They work harder. If they leave, they tell us. This building had private funds

We tried this once. We got an outside electrical contracting estimate from an electrical contractor, and it was exactly the same.

If we give the customer the option, then I would feel better about it.

That’s a hard question because we work here, but looking at it as a customer, you do want to shop around to get best service and deal.

As people who work here, we would like people to not want to, but when they do that it does hold us who work here more accountable, and we’re only going to get better if accountability is raised, myself included.”

If energy and safety are maintained, then I’m OK with it.

Some customers have gone outside, and it has backfired. Sometimes I think customer might not understand that getting that work done by an outsider and what the ramifications are if we have to follow up on project, such as paint matching.

Customers go off campus to hire their nanny’s husband to paint a room or even on big projects, and it should not be allowed.

We want all the work, but we can’t set ourselves up to fail. There are ramifications to that if we say we can do it.

Are there specifications in Manual of Business Procedures that say people have to use us? No, we think not.

What is our company line that we are towing, though? Do we want people to handle certain things on their own? Should we give them guidelines?

It’s not just the information and history or expertise that’s gained; it’s the knowledge of working with each other

No, it’s too hard to communicate our needs to an outside firm when we have already developed that information with XXX
No. Never. Because MSU people understand our bureaucratic and culture challenges.

Sometimes we get wrapped up in things, but we aren’t the star. We are here to support the academic mission of the university.

The maintenance shops are invaluable.

The sense of stewardship on campus is very high and the culture is that stewardship is important including the maintenance shops.

We’re MSU – “we need all the help we can get.” It’s a team sport and we’re MSU.

**In general, what would do differently if you were in charge of the project delivery process? What business practices do you currently use that would beneficial to the capital project process?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>689</td>
<td>I think we are weakest at the beginning and the end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td>As far as business practices: “put responsibility for tasks in the hands of people getting them done- and get the heck out of the way. Interference comes from above. How much money is wasted having people do things not related to the project.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691</td>
<td>Cumbersome with BOT meetings and approvals to plan after it’s really already planned. Seeking approval to plan when you had to plan to take anything to the BOT is awkward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692</td>
<td>Do departments have to come to the Phys Plant with a good idea of what they need to do and they go with guidance from there? Can they come to PP with just an idea and have the PP really lead the project and guide them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693</td>
<td>Electronic service request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694</td>
<td>Expect expansion of medical facilities into SE Michigan, so more of this is to come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695</td>
<td>How do you bring new people up to speed? Furthering PMI would capture it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696</td>
<td>We should standardize the process across all departments in the Division and across the University because there are other players who do things differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697</td>
<td>We should survey customers and find out where their frustrations are and educate them more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698</td>
<td>Do you remember doing pre-focus groups with all parties before a project started? I thought that worked really well. It laid out the expectations at start and worked well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td>Project partnering is the first time I heard about “stakeholders.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>We should have documentation in the records about how this worked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>I keep hearing that people are mad about the fees, so then why are we not funded through the University? - The true frustration is not knowing what the fees are and if they are standard. There is a complete lack of clarity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This should be part of the customer training, explaining the fee structure and why it benefits them. It is interesting because we have customers all over the board – some who question every fee and some who don’t question anything.

We should streamline the BOT process, and we still need an HR class or video or something. I don’t want customers to be mad at me. If they know upfront, at least they will understand more.

Is there something we can do? If we have access to Skire, can we get an estimate? Will that be a problem? Is that a concern? I would welcome it. I am willing to learn it.

Need EBS-type system to review projects at any time would be very helpful.

If we are all representing a piece of the project, we all come back together at end to hold each other accountable and know we all accomplished it. Not like that at PP – you don’t know who’s working on it or if it’s getting done or when it’s done.

Would that allow people access to see their project’s progress.

As a professional, I would act like a professional. Return calls, Common courtesy, run a customer service organization and - PP needs to think of things in those terms – client already has a hard time with U, so PP can help with customer service.

What your contractor would be delivering if pouring you a concrete driveway - Clean up, leave smooth. Those same judgments are not made at Phys Plant.

Giant oil stain left on door for parent’s weekend. I shouldn’t have to call Custodial, Key Shop, Carpentry, etc. “One call should do it all.”

We’ve gone opposite of turnkey, we like to do all on our own to get better pricing, etc, but have to bird-dog every thing.

Standards too high for their projects. - IDEA: Diff standards levels.

Common service request when call someone for basic service – would be really nice if they checked in with WHO ISSUED service request vs. someone at door. Touch base with actual requestor. They come and go and I didn’t even know.

How to communicate why two people needed? Something on website or something to explain why. List what the process is and what to expect. Capital projects vs. Dispatch. General flow and how to understand how charges work.

Maybe implement a 1-800 number to report issues, complaints. People don’t know who to call when they have issues so they don’t get resolved.

We should streamline the delivery and then have one way to deliver during construction versus partial owner and partial contractor.

An online video sounds good, too.

I think the project management process overview – is there a clearly written plan of action? Does everyone have an opportunity to understand everything that is happening? How does the Communication/Collaboration happen throughout the project?

I want a road map: Who’s doing what and roles and who’s point of comm.? Uncharted territory with tenant situations, but having a road map would have been helpful. Starting to codify all of this for these situations.

I would keep key performance indicators in front of the group – maybe we get a little lost and need something to bring us back to the path.

It is difficult to figure out who to talk to and what is needed and how it all works.
On residence halls working with variety of architects – some have web-based sites where we could obtain documents. I think it being an expectation could help – make my role easier and creates a lot of transparency.

On-site Phys presence.

Our department claims tremendous value using the PMI – We have also used with internal processes.

Reasonable closeout time would be good. The warranties over and should be done with ancillary costs to project.

Reasonable closeout time would be good. The warranties over and should be done with ancillary costs to project.

The fact that Telecom wires all of our buildings is absurd. They don’t have to be competitive, don’t bid, they hand you the cost and get to when they get to it. We’re at their mercy.

The length of the process can be cumbersome.

The process would be improved with a documented process defining who what and when.

There needs to be a one stop point of contact we need to have somebody who we know to go to. Somebody to call the just ask “hows it going?”

This could be done with a project charter or any number of ways but the plan needs to be clearly defined. Strength lies in giving people levels of information. High-level rules, documents/regulations, in one place. Then deeper into project and layout fo

Track service requests. Update the customers.

Two words: Streamline and simplify through the whole process

Why can’t there be standardized charges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>735</td>
<td>A lot could be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736</td>
<td>Have to market themselves every single time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737</td>
<td>How is it decided whether to use internal or external interior design? The customer may decide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738</td>
<td>I admire the service vehicles because they are the only ones that do the speed limit or under, while CATA buses speed through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>I called purchasing and that agent said all carpet had to go through interior design. I had checked the carpet type criteria and this type was OK at MSU. I didn’t want to send to interior design and have them charge and it sits in a pile for that agent to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>It seems the interior design services group needs to market themselves and only seem to get invited whenever RHS feels like it. This is another inconsistency and the history and expertise of what works at the university is lost because of it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was a successful project. There was open Communication/Collaboration throughout.

moving air intakes and having to move twice bc first gagging on vehicle exhaust, then moved to third floor and was a diff problem. When complained was told “you’re not an engineer.” Understood, but they need to do a better job of listening to customers.

Some of battles we have are things that PP designed and built w/o listening to the users and needs of users.

End of the day, we make it work

This is why XXX college has hired (a facility person to look after projects) – to run interference with PP.

Work with them for water on south campus. Some comm. issues. Red water alerts – often time that ends up in one of our fields when we might be about to bale hay.

Customer callbacks have trailed off. Used to be better.

They don’t do it unless you ask. Go down and look at handrails – filthy. Have to put in request for that to be done. Don’t scrub urinals – just put soap and leave it. Lightbulbs – don’t change until say have 40 dead bulbs on fourth floor. Not proactive.

Was your project completed satisfactorily? Is the one and only question. Would prefer email with five or so questions. Survey format.

We use complex PP services and there are multiple probs. Some (PP) doing minimum to get by and there are exceptions of course. Also have some incompetent people in Mgt. and don’t know if people on top really care. Used to complain to Flinn.

Graffiti on the building. Been there for over one year. How many custodians and PP personnel have come in and out building in past year without it getting done?” “Feel I’m a professional complainer... ot getting our fair share of the services.”

fairly limited on south campus farms. Looked at them for Demmer Center for fee, but cost-comparativley they weren’t cost-effective. Wanted to give business, but couldn’t afford it.

Have also found beds in various places where people.” “People at top don’t know what’s going on in trenches. If it were a business, these people would be gone.”

If you don’t know the right person, it’s problematic.

Do union workers provide same level of work at MSU as what’s expected of union workers in private sector?

I think the message is being delivered to PP time after time after time. Deans have expressed it time and again. I know what people have said very high up, and I am very skeptical that things will change

It was a successful project. There was open Communication/Collaboration throughout.

No set process = XXXX has to sell XXXXX and Phys Plant decides “free for all”

Other parts that should be a part of MSU Way...not just capital projects. How does someone move? Order, what, when? Relocation process.

Past experience = mostly academic projects with the Phys Plant

Personal opinion = XXXX should always be involved with capital projects to help them through process (service requests, when and what to do). XXX knows all the intricacies of what is needed at MSU
Service trucks will park in the loading dock ALL the TIME and have to call to have them moved because I have a delivery. There is a dedicated spot for university vehicles and it is never used.

Sometimes when rendering shown = they (BOT, higher ups) all expect to see it built EXACTLY as it is in the picture

Sometimes when rendering shown = they (BOT, higher ups) all expect to see it built EXACTLY as it is in the picture

The MSU interior design is not an apples-to-apples comparison because our internal design services does a lot more coordination with telecom or ATS and does a number of things that an interior design service firm doesn’t perform.

The wrong people are given a voice to send things back and say “no”. There’s a circuitous process because reps aren’t able to lead as rep for project/customer.

The wrong people are given a voice to send things back and say “no”. There’s a circuitous process because reps aren’t able to lead as rep for project/customer.

This benefits the customer as an end result. And interior design only charges for the time expended as compared to a hard dollar percentage fee tacked on to the total costs for the job

What is the decision making criteria for the interior design services to be used on capital projects? There doesn’t seem to be any.

When the Phys Plant newsletter used to go to all employees, it was very poorly received. Improvement now because it does not go to all employees, but our director throws it right in the trash. It’s wasteful, not very sustainable, can’t it be electronic?

When the Phys Plant newsletter used to go to all employees, it was very poorly received. Improvement now because it does not go to all employees, our director throws it right in the trash. It’s wasteful, can’t it be electronic?

Why should there only be a percentage fee? There should be accountability attached to it to charge time. The fee does not represent who is actually working on the project

With all of the overlapping responsibilities and roles, there should be more accountability for who gets charged to the job.

List all the departments or entities that you recall interacting with during your capital project(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>DO political arena (Michigan Osteopath Association and various channels connected, including lobbyists; broadcast service, Health IT, college departments, accreditation, MSU FCU credit union, employee relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>EAS, PIA, ATS Surplus, Purchasing, Environmental Health and Safety, University Physicians, DPPS, RCPD, CPA, Telecom, MSUPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>HR re: hiring arrangements, MSU unions, office of Inclusion, Dave Bylick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>IDS, darla at DMC, Macomm cast, leadership at SE sites, FPSM Purchasing, anatomy vendors, leasing office, Chuck Reid, construction companies and vendor, tech vendors, Telecom, VPFO, the press,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>778</td>
<td>Numerous...Phys Plant (EAS, Team, trades), ATS, Public Safety, CIPWG, BOT, Ginny Haas, LCCTP, RHS, Student Services, OPB, FPSM, Public art on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>779</td>
<td>resident, BOT, provost, Land manage, PP, ATS, save gift/VPLCT, MSU librarians Denbow/UR, Merrit—nonprofit organization consortium (institutions of higher ed and hospitals and other nonprofits – support fiber optics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other questions or comments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>“It was a joy.” It was a good project and we look forward to expanding – “I’d love to do it again.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>As a client, it was a pleasure, got what we needed and was very helpful for me and my team and having someone on site was very important. Open comm. the entire time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>Still growing and have needs (more plugs needed/electrical), but we are “extremely pleased.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783</td>
<td>Testament to faculty/staff – hard to get people down here b/c coming to Detroit, but almost unanimously, they are delighted to work here once they get here and want permanent arrangements; students self-select this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Were the services delivered seamlessly between the MSU service entities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>784</td>
<td>For the most part yes, but always some glitches. ATS was weakest link Communication/Collaboration-wise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>785</td>
<td>Seamless is like “always” or “never” – we do deliver it, but it is not seamless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>786</td>
<td>As new people to come on board, they have to learn it all over again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>787</td>
<td>I think it’s important to do it from a customer perspective. We can always do better. There are efforts expended to do this in all departments. Skire is an example of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788</td>
<td>No. I’m very satisfied with EAS, But when it leaves that shop (Physical Plant) – Katy-bar the door – anything can happen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Were the services delivered seamlessly between the MSU service entities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>789</td>
<td>It is difficult to figure out who to talk to and what is needed and how it all works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>This is a new time, we are all always learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>Any assistance we can have as far as additional projects we would really appreciate it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>792</td>
<td>Right now there is no accountability. Not sure if there is any discipline. I complained about XXXX to Dean. But, if outside contractor doesn’t do the job, we call them again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793</td>
<td>There is a trust gap. “Every time I have to do something I think ‘here comes another headache down the road.’”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794</td>
<td>They scare the neighbors, too. HAZMAT suits all in one office. Asbestos in carpet adhesive and that is disconcerting when no notification. Or notification that is vague. Had to call to ask for more info. “Was satisfied once I called.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>Custodians are responsible to requests, but I find that I have to make too many requests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over past years, things much better at Contracts and Grants. For years, said PP then CGA were worst-managed entities on campus. But CGA has really turned it around. But never know with PP as far where we’re at with project expenses.

On service side, we forget that students, research, etc. run the University. We are there to service so they can do the things that matter here. I just want to do my science and engineering and get my patents out and do what I love.

Should have remained with PP doing Land Management projects but essentially service, cost, results not up to par.

There is real lack of teamwork between depts. Our reno there was a PP component, then telecom, then an ATS component – and it would have been nice for a PM to tell us what to do/who to contact. Not a real group effort to get the work done.

Telecom is very high-priced, very much like salespeople and don’t care for them, and they always seem to have problems.

They have to bird-dog so Communication/Collaboration closets don’t get omitted.

We spent extra to tree and it was dead next year. Impression is that they are big dogs, They get/do what they want. They don’t ask us re: landscape design around building.

Would it be helpful to have a team always devoted to your projects - Would say ‘no’ as they would come in thinking they know about our projects. I think the project rep is the key.

But lack of blueprint on how pieces fit together was frustrating. Now have a bigger comm. loop for next buildings – including lots of people from various MSU offices in emails to keep on line.

Can (ATS) be on Famis? They do TVs, wireless, Ethernet, etc.

Everyone responsive and took responsibility.

For the most part yes, but always some glitches. ATS was weakest link Communication/Collaboration-wise.

MSU departments: seamless is not right word. Challenges: Purchasing and how we interact with them and PP and having trouble piecing it all together. Purchasing was “black hole.”

No.

No. I’m very satisfied with EAS, But when it leaves that shop (Physical Plant) – Katy-bar the door – anything can happen

No. The process of this was sitting down with the group and brainstorming who should be involved and getting it figured out.

No...no...no

Once the floor plan is approved (they?) are more involved.

Project Planning Team via CIPWG = boxes are getting checked, but they do not respond, participate or are they going to the appropriate people.

The academic buildings are their priorities.

The lack of a blue print is frustrating.

The technology has moved so much faster than other aspects of the construction process.
There is a connection with XXX regardless of infrastructure.

There is confusion for who is responsible for what.

There is no way with their staffing they could attend all of the meetings.

There needs to be a one stop point of contact we need to have somebody who we know to go to. Somebody to call the just ask “how’s it going?”

They might be more interested if we ask them what they think instead of just telling them what we want.

Things fell in hole after someone took over for (someone who left the Org)

We generally like PP to do the work, but the timing and engagement is not always good.

We have no idea what else they have on their plate and what their scheduling is.

Why have we been doing this so long and not thought that a documented process is a good idea? We generally have successful projects but why does it have to be so undefined?

XXX might be providing software while XXX is providing the actual machines.

### What about construction standards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>828</td>
<td>They cost us money, I know some standards are good to last and value (plumbing and roofing), but we generally don’t need 100 year buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829</td>
<td>The greening of the University is extremely important. I or no one else here would question that. LEED certification is a credit to the University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>