Sightlines LLC
FY2012 Facilities MB&A Presentation
Montana State University

Colin Sanders, Thomas Huberty, Gabriella Rosas
Date: February 6th, 2013
Sightlines profile

290+ campuses, 1.2 Billion GSF in Sightlines database

Common Vocabulary —— Consistent Methodology —— Context through Benchmarking
Facilities Measurement, Benchmarking, and Analysis

- All State and Auxiliary Facilities
  - Annual Stewardship
  - Asset Reinvestment
  - Operating Effectiveness
  - Service

Go-Green Measurement Benchmarking and Analysis.

- Total Campus
Facilities Benchmarking- How Are We Doing?

Core Objectives for the Analysis

• Identify opportunities to improve operational effectiveness
• Separate fact from fiction by providing objective measures on key issues
  – Operational performance
  – Service levels
  – Funding needs
• Document trends, provide consistent measurement, and comparable benchmarking
• Act as a catalyst for discussion and improvement
• Develop a common vocabulary for operational managers and business officers as we discuss issues
• Develop a shared context for strategic decision making
Facilities’ role in supporting MSU’s strategic plan
A vocabulary for measurement

The Return on Physical Assets – ROPA™

The annual investment needed to ensure buildings will properly perform and reach their useful life

“Keep-Up Costs”

The accumulated backlog of repair and modernization needs and the definition of resource capacity to correct them

“Catch-Up Costs”

The effectiveness of the facilities operating budget, staffing, supervision, and energy management

The measure of service process, the maintenance quality of space and systems, and the customers opinion of service delivery

Annual Stewardship

Asset Reinvestment

Operational Effectiveness

Service

Asset Value Change

Operations Success
A vocabulary for measurement

The Return on Physical Assets – ROPA<sup>SM</sup>

- R&R (Aux)
- Major Maintenance
- Corrective maintenance
- Scheduled maintenance
- Preventive maintenance

- Bond Proceeds
- Loans
- LRBP
- Insurance
- Department/research funded

- Energy Consumption
- Staffing Metrics
- Work Orders
- Planned Maintenance

- Customer Satisfaction Survey
- Campus Inspection
- Work Order Process

Asset Value Change

Operations Success
### Peer Institutions

**Comparable and qualified benchmarking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic &amp; Research (A&amp;R) Peer Institutions</th>
<th>Auxiliary (AUX) Peer Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>Mississippi State University - Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>New Mexico State University - Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico State University</td>
<td>Portland State University - Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>The University of Maine - Aux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>University of Colorado - Boulder - Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado - Boulder</td>
<td>University of Idaho - Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>University of New Hampshire - Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>University of Rhode Island-Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>University of Southern Mississippi - Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MSU core observations

More challenging physical profile
- Less new construction and fewer large-scale renovations has lead to an older campus profile, with 72% of A&R space and 79% of Auxiliary space more than 25 years old
- Campus characteristics complicate both capital investment and maintenance strategies

Recent capital spending tracking near target, focused on energy improvements
- Academic & Research funding over past five years ahead of peers, however it has been supplemented with historically unique sources that may not be sustainable or reliable
- Auxiliary funding on par with younger peers. Given physical profile funding has not been able to arrest growth in backlog
- Older facilities and historically low spending has resulted in an elevated backlog on both campus profiles

Operational performance shows impacts of higher backlog, campus profile
- Facilities operating budget for A&R is comparable to peers, but Auxiliary’s operating budget is lower, and both are well below the Sightlines database average
- Despite challenging physical profile, operations team is producing competitive results based on inspection and customer satisfaction scores
Physical Profile
Space profile overview

Distribution of Montana State GSF

Academic & Research
- Total GSF: 2,180,337
- # Buildings: 101
- # Buildings Cleaned: 55
- Weighted Reno. Age: 42.5

Auxiliary
- Total GSF: 2,270,664
- # Buildings: 184
- # Buildings Cleaned: 38
- Weighted Reno. Age: 41.6

Other
- Total GSF: 393,388
- # Buildings: 119
- # Buildings Cleaned: 119
- Weighted Reno. Age: 20.7
MSU in context: Age Profile
Both MSU profiles older than peers

% of Space by Age Category

- **Buildings over 50**
  - Life cycles of major building components are past due. Failures are possible. Core modernization cycles are missed.
  - Highest risk

- **Buildings 25 to 50**
  - Life cycles are coming due in envelope and mechanical systems. Functional obsolescence prevalent.
  - Higher Risk

- **Buildings 10 to 25**
  - Lower cost space renewal updates and initial signs of program pressures
  - Medium Risk

- **Buildings Under 10**
  - Little work, “honeymoon” period.
  - Low Risk

*Legend:*
- **Under 10**
- **10 to 25**
- **25 to 50**
- **50 and Above**
MSU in context: Age Profile
Both MSU profiles older than peers

% of Space by Age Category

Montana St. - A&R
High Risk 72%
- Under 10: 14%
- 10 to 25: 14%
- 25 to 50: 38%
- 50 and Above: 34%

A&R Peers
High Risk 70%
- Under 10: 11%
- 10 to 25: 19%
- 25 to 50: 36%
- 50 and Above: 34%

Montana St. - AUX
High Risk 79%
- Under 10: 12%
- 10 to 25: 9%
- 25 to 50: 41%
- 50 and Above: 38%

AUX Peers
High Risk 66%
- Under 10: 22%
- 10 to 25: 41%
- 25 to 50: 41%
- 50 and Above: 25%
MSU in context: Density Factor
Density increasing with growing enrollment

Density Factor

MSU Total Campus
Change in Space & Population

Density Factor Impacts:
- Wear and tear on facilities
- Custodial staffing
- Campus appearance

Benchmark using A&R Peers
*2020 Enrollment estimate from the “MSU Strategic Plan 2012: Metric A.1.7”
**MSU in context: Density Factor**

Density increasing with growing enrollment

**Density Factor**

**MSU Total Campus**
Change in Space & Population

**Density Factor Impacts:**
- Wear and tear on facilities
- Custodial staffing
- Campus appearance

*Benchmark using A&R Peers
*2020 Enrollment estimate from the “MSU Strategic Plan 2012: Metric A.1.7”*
MSU in context: Building Intensity

Far more buildings comprise campus GSF than at peer institutions

**Building Intensity**

**A&R vs. Peers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildings/1M GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Intensity**

**AUX vs. Peers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildings/1M GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Intensity Impacts:**

- Capital demand
- Operational efficiency
- Energy consumption
MSU in context: Building Intensity

Far more buildings comprise campus GSF than at peer institutions

**Building Intensity**
A&R vs. Peers

Under 10k GSF
- 218 Buildings
- 0.57M GSF

Over 10k GSF
- 67 Buildings
- 3.88M GSF

**Building Intensity Impacts:**
- Capital demand
- Operational efficiency
- Energy consumption
Capital Analysis
Total capital spending
Total FY12 investment was $44M

Total Capital Spending

Academic & Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Existing Space</th>
<th>Non-Facilities/New Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2008</td>
<td>$17 M</td>
<td>$16 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2009</td>
<td>$27 M</td>
<td>$2.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td>$28 M</td>
<td>$2.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>$12 M</td>
<td>$9.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>$26 M</td>
<td>$18 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg: $9.6 M

Auxiliary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Existing Space</th>
<th>Non-Facilities/New Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2008</td>
<td>$17 M</td>
<td>$16 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2009</td>
<td>$27 M</td>
<td>$2.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td>$28 M</td>
<td>$2.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>$12 M</td>
<td>$9.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>$26 M</td>
<td>$18 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg: $22 M
Total capital spending
Total FY12 investment was $44M
Defining a stewardship target

Montana State University – Entire Campus
FY2012 Stewardship Targets

- **$23.2** in Millions
- **$20.7**
- **$10.8**

**Academic & Research**
- 3% Replacement Value
- Life Cycle Need (Equilibrium)
- Functional Obsolescence (Target)

**Auxiliary**
- 3% Replacement Value
- Life Cycle Need (Equilibrium)
- Functional Obsolescence (Target)

Sightlines Recommendations

- Industry Estimate
- Sightlines Recommendations

Industry Estimate

Sightlines Recommendations
Total investment vs. targets
Gaines and Cooley renovations push total A&R spending into target range

Total Project Spending vs. Target

Academic & Research

- Equilibrium Need
- Target Need

Millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
<td>$25.0</td>
<td>$30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Auxiliary

- Equilibrium Need
- Target Need

Millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
<td>$25.0</td>
<td>$30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Annual Stewardship
- Asset Reinvestment
Total funding compared to peers
Unique funding amounts to $4.07/GSF annually during this period

Total Project Spending vs. Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4.24</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A&R Peers

Database Avg.

Avg: $4.24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.11</td>
<td>$1.11</td>
<td>$1.11</td>
<td>$1.11</td>
<td>$1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unique funding amounts to $4.07/GSF annually during this period

Academic & Research

Avg: $7.35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total funding compared to Carnegie peers
Comparing to other universities with “very high research activity”

Total Project Spending vs. Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Carnegie Peers</th>
<th>Academic &amp; Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2008</td>
<td>Avg: $1.62</td>
<td>Avg: $7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2009</td>
<td>Avg: $1.62</td>
<td>Avg: $7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td>Avg: $5.77</td>
<td>Avg: $7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>Avg: $5.77</td>
<td>Avg: $7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>Avg: $5.77</td>
<td>Avg: $7.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note change in Peer Group
Total funding compared to peers
Younger peers investing at very low levels; MSU Auxiliary average below database

Total Project Spending vs. Peers

- **Auxiliary Peers**
  - **Campus Age**
    - 66% Avg: $0.54 (FY2008)
    - 34% Avg: $2.63 (FY2009)
    - Database Average: $2.63

- **Auxiliary**
  - **Campus Age**
    - 21% Avg: $0.92 (FY2008)
    - 79% Avg: $3.35 (FY2009)
    - Database Average: $3.35

- **FY2008**
  - Annual Stewardship: $0.92
  - Asset Reinvestment: $3.35

- **FY2009**
  - Annual Stewardship: $0.92
  - Asset Reinvestment: $3.35

- **FY2010**
  - Annual Stewardship: $0.92
  - Asset Reinvestment: $3.35

- **FY2011**
  - Annual Stewardship: $0.92
  - Asset Reinvestment: $3.35

- **FY2012**
  - Annual Stewardship: $0.92
  - Asset Reinvestment: $3.35
Backlog $20/GSF ($40M) higher than peers

Total backlog of need – A&R

Defining “Backlog of Need”

- **Deferred Maintenance**: Projects to address building components at or beyond life cycle
- **Modernization**: Projects to address programmatic functionality of space
- **Infrastructure**: Projects in campus utility infrastructure or grounds

Methodology:

- Estimates based on database of 60+ backlog studies Sightlines has conducted
- Factor for age, tech rating, function, and historical investment into facilities

Database Average: $89/GSF
Backlog $20/GSF ($40M) higher than peers
Total backlog of need – A&R

Total Backlog of Need – A&R ($/GSF)

- Transitional State (Gut Reno/Demo)
- Systemic Renovation
- Repair and Maintain
- Capital Upkeep

Database Avg.: $89/GSF

A&R Peers
- FY08
- FY09
- FY10
- FY11
- FY12

MSU - A&R

$120.00
$100.00
$80.00
$60.00
$40.00
$20.00
$0.00

$/GSF

11% increase
1% decrease
Auxiliary facilities’ backlog higher than peers

**Total Backlog of Need – Auxiliary ($/GSF)**

- **Database Avg.:** $89/GSF
- **13% increase** from FY08 to FY10 for MSU - AUX
- **20% increase** from FY08 to FY09 for AUX Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AUX Peers</th>
<th>MSU - AUX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>$48.00</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>$78.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Categories:**
- Transitional State (Gut Reno/Demo)
- Systemic Renovation
- Repair and Maintain
- Capital Upkeep
Operational impact of higher backlog and older facilities
Despite high backlog operating budget on par with peers

Facilities operating budget – A&R

Data shown excludes utilities costs
Auxiliary budget $2M lower than peers
Facilities operating budget – Auxiliary

Facilities Operating Budget

Auxiliary Peers

Montana St. Auxiliary

Data shown excludes utilities costs
Asking more of maintenance staff

Maintenance workers covering more space, twice as many buildings

Data shown is entire campus, as Auxiliary does not have a separate Maintenance crew. Using A&R Peers
Custodial Coverage – A&R

Older facilities, higher backlog, and increasing campus density contribute to metrics

**Custodial Coverage – A&R**

**Cleaned Buildings/FTE – A&R**

**A&R Peers**

- Cleanliness Inspection: 4.0 out of 5.0
- Customer Satisfaction: 3.9 out of 5.0

**Peers**

- Cleanliness Inspection: 4.1 out of 5.0
- Customer Satisfaction: 3.8 out of 5.0

*Chart arranged by Density Factor Using A&R Peers*
Custodial Coverage - Auxiliaries

Older facilities, higher backlog, and increasing campus density contribute to metrics.

**Custodial Coverage – AUX**

**Cleaned Buildings/FTE – AUX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness Inspection</th>
<th>AUX</th>
<th>Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 out of 5.0</td>
<td>4.1 out of 5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart arranged by Density Factor
Using AUX Peers
Grounds Coverage – Campus Wide

**Chart arranged by Grounds Intensity**

*Data shown is entire campus, as Auxiliary does not have a separate Grounds crew. Using A&R Peers*
Highest Occupancy in Housing in 5 years

Utilizing more beds in recent years

- First Year Freshmen living on campus
- Sophomores
- Juniors
- Seniors
- Graduate

Total Beds available in both Res Life and FGH facilities

Headcount

- 2008
- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012

- 0
- 500
- 1,000
- 1,500
- 2,000
- 2,500
- 3,000
- 3,500
- 4,000
- 4,500

Montana State University
Capital Projects: Mix of Spending

Longitudinal Mix of Spending

- **MSU - A&R**
  - Building Envelope: 23%
  - Building System: 39%
  - Infrastructure: 8%
  - Space: 27%
  - Code: 2%

- **Peers**
  - Building Envelope: 12%
  - Building System: 25%
  - Infrastructure: 24%
  - Space: 32%
  - Code: 7%

- **MSU - AUX**
  - Building Envelope: 11%
  - Building System: 31%
  - Infrastructure: 9%
  - Space: 43%
  - Code: 4%

- **Peers**
  - Building Envelope: 11%
  - Building System: 33%
  - Infrastructure: 4%
  - Space: 37%
  - Code: 15%
Total Utility Consumption

11% energy conservation correlates to a $1.2M cost avoidance

Total Energy Consumption

Go-Green Peers shown

© Sightlines 2001-2013
MSU has seen strong reductions in total emissions

Emissions picture further improves when normalizing by enrollment

Gross Emissions (per 1,000 GSF)

Gross Emissions (per student FTE)

Go-Green Peers shown
Campus commuting profile - Students
A higher rate of student commuters than average

Major Impacts for Commuting Emissions

How Many?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Users Commuting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Information from MSU FY12 commuter survey
Campus commuting profile- Students
Traveling a shorter distance than peers

Major Impacts for Commuting Emissions

How Many?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Users Commuting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Far?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average One-Way Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9 Miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Information from MSU FY12 commuter survey
Campus commuting profile - Students

Commuting profile defined by longer trip distance and drive alone habits

Student Commuters by Mode

Major Impacts for Commuting Emissions

How Many?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Users Commuting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Far?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average One-Way Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Mode?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% by Automobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Information from MSU FY12 commuter survey
Campus commuting profile - Students
Carbon-free mode above peer and database average

Note: Information from MSU FY12 commuter survey
Low total commuting emission
Mode, distance, and miles factor into total commuting emissions

![Bar chart showing total commuting emissions for different locations.](chart.png)
Total waste stream and recycling rates

Room for improvement for recycling rate on campus

Recycling Rate (%)

Landfill vs. Diversion Rates

- Landfill Waste
- Trad. Recycling
- Compost
- Other Diversions
Conclusion
Summary

Focus on Energy Initiatives Paying Dividends

Key Takeaways

Total Energy Consumption

11% Reduction
Key Takeaways

Summary

Maintenance Coverage

Higher Coverage

Building Intensity

More buildings
Key Takeaways

Summary

% of Space >25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSU A&amp;R</th>
<th>A&amp;R Peers</th>
<th>MSU Aux</th>
<th>Aux Peers</th>
<th>Database Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Backlog of Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSU A&amp;R</th>
<th>A&amp;R Peers</th>
<th>MSU Aux</th>
<th>Aux Peers</th>
<th>Database Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Older Facilities

Higher Backlog
Questions and Comments