STATE OF WASHINGTON

2015-17 CAPITAL PROJECTS EVALUATION SYSTEM

Four-Year Higher Education Institutions
Project Evaluation Guidelines and Submittal Instructions

Office of Financial Management
Budget Division

JUNE 2014

Table of Contents

2015-17 Capital Project Evaluation System: Four-Year Higher Education Institutions

Project Evaluation Guidelines and Submittal Instructions

Overview of Contents

Chapter 1 summarizes the purpose of the capital project evaluation system, and the state's strategic and financial environment. This section highlights changes to the scoring process for 2015-17, as suggested by 2013-15 participants, legislative staff and the Legislature. Key dates also are provided.

Chapter 2 describes the evaluation framework and defines project categories.

Chapter 3 outlines the evaluation process, including evaluation panel structure and process phases.

Chapter 4 includes submittal guidelines, instructions for project proposals, and a checklist for required elements.

Chapter 5 provides the expected project cost ranges by type of facility and construction cost index for escalating costs to mid-construction date.

Chapter 6 lists minimum thresholds, describes the overarching evaluation criteria, and includes details on category-specific evaluation criteria and scoring standards.

Chapter 1

Project Evaluation Objectives and Schedule

BACKGROUND

Legislative Intent. The 2008 Legislature enacted Chapter 43.88D RCW, establishing a new process for evaluating and scoring capital project requests by the state's four-year higher education institutions. The legislation highlighted the importance of strategic planning in the facility prioritization process, stating that the new process must emphasize "objective analysis, a statewide perspective, and a strategic balance among facility preservation, new construction, and innovative delivery mechanisms."

The Legislature's intent was to develop a transparent and objective system that gives four-year institutions the opportunity to articulate their capital facility needs while enabling decision-makers to identify tradeoffs and make the best strategic choices given limited state resources.

In 2012, the Legislature reaffirmed the evaluation and scoring system established in 2008 and again validated the concept of a single prioritized list.

State Strategic and Financial Context. In accordance with RCW 43.88D.010, OFM is to score projects based on, at a minimum, an evaluation of enrollment trends, reasonableness of cost, the ability of the project to enhance specific strategic master plan goals, age and condition of the facility (if applicable), and impact on space utilization. RCW 28B.77.070 directs OFM to provide the Governor and Legislature with a single prioritized list of the major projects for consideration of funding during the 2015-17 biennium. For the single prioritized list, OFM is to prioritize projects based on the following criteria in order of importance: preserving assets; degree production; and maximizing efficient use of instructional space.

In addition to these two guiding statutes, proviso language in the 2013-15 capital budget (Section 7008, Chapter 19, Laws of 2013, 2nd Special Session) directs OFM to develop a single prioritized list of **all** projects requesting funding with the exception of minor works and predesign requests. Further, OFM shall increase the weighting of reasonableness of cost, and projects shall be scored only once unless the institution or OFM find that the project scope or budget has changed significantly.

The state continues to face significant constraints on its ability to fund higher education capital facilities. Given these challenges, the capital project evaluation and scoring system is intended to align the state's higher education goals with capital facility spending choices. Other objectives of the system include:

- Providing decision-makers with a comprehensive and accurate analysis of the relative value of potential capital projects;
- Providing comparable information across multiple institutions and projects; and
- Developing and conducting a transparent, fair and understandable project evaluation process.

WHAT'S THE SAME FOR 2015-17?

The 2013-15 evaluation process included significant changes that have been maintained for the 2015-17 evaluation process. A recap of some of those changes:

1. Establishment of subcategories for stand-alone projects costing between $2 million and $5 million. There is now a new subcategory under each major category so that these projects can be evaluated separately from the major projects. Furthermore, the overarching criteria will not be applied to stand-

alone projects. Institutional priority points will be applied separately across an agency's stand-alone project submittals from the priority points applied across its major project proposals more than $5 million.

2. The overarching criteria have been revamped to provide a more quantitative approach to evaluating proposals. Additionally, it has been incorporated into the major categories of growth, renovation, replacement, and research, and will no longer be evaluated by a separate panel. It will instead be evaluated by a specific panel in each category.

3. The category "acquisition" (formerly "land acquisition") includes land acquisitions, facility acquisitions, and/or land acquisitions that include built improvements.

4. Institutions will be required to provide a checklist with each project proposal on which they will check off and certify the items that have been submitted. OFM evaluation team facilitators will no longer be checking proposals for completeness.

5. RCW 70.235.070 directs agencies to consider whether entities receiving capital funds through competitive programs for infrastructure and economic development projects have adopted policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. While required for capital budget submittals, this item will not be scored for the 2015-17 scoring cycle, and no documentation is required for the prioritization process. See the 2015-17 Capital Budget Instructions for documentation required for capital project requests.

6. The availability-of-space criteria encourage projects that improve utilization on a campus, but do not meet the space utilization standards.

7. At this time, the project review process is conducted in two meetings. After the scoring process is complete, OFM will debrief and present scoring results to four-year institutions and other stakeholders. Attendance at this meeting will be optional.

8. Institutional priority points will be submitted separately to the OFM higher education budget analyst and will remain confidential until after the evaluation panels have completed the scoring. This is to ensure a fair evaluation of the projects on their own merits.

9. Any further changes will be issued by addendum.

WHAT'S NEW FOR 2015-17?

The Legislature passed bills that made some changes to the higher education prioritization process. Additionally, changes have been made based on feedback received from proposers and evaluators resulting from the 2013-15 evaluation process. Significant changes include:

1. Projects shall be scored only once unless OFM or the requesting school find that the project scope or budget has significantly changed. Projects that have previously been scored for design, but not funded for design construction, retain their original score for the project. A project whose scope or budget has significantly changed will have to be resubmitted for scoring. Recognizing that the scoring criteria evolve from biennium to biennium, an institution may choose to resubmit a project for scoring.

2. Weighting for reasonableness of cost is increased.

3. Predesigns are scored and shall be on a separate prioritized list.

KEY DATES FOR 2015-17 CAPITAL PROJECT EVALUATION PROCESS (REVISED 6-27-14)

Capital budget instructions, evaluation guidelines and submittal instructions released	June 2014
Institutions nominate panel members to assist in scoring	June 16 - June 30, 2014
OFM recruits panel members from agencies and creates evaluation panels	June 16 - June 30, 2014
Question and answer period: Responses and additional information posted to website (in general, responses will be posted within two working days)	June 16 - July 15, 2014
Institutions submit completed predesign documents to OFM	July 1, 2014
Institutions submit preliminary number of proposals per category to OFM	July 1, 2014
Institutions submit **prioritized list** of project proposals	August 1, 2014 *
Institutions submit project proposals and supporting documents for evaluation	**August 15, 2014 ***
Evaluation panels meeting #1: orientation and charge	August 25-29, 2014
Panel members independently review project proposals	August 25 - September 5, 2014
Panel members forward follow-up questions to panel facilitator	On or before September 2, 2014
Institutions respond to follow-up questions	September 2-5, 2014
Evaluation panels meeting #2: complete project scoring	September 8-12, 2014
OFM compiles scoring results	September 15-19, 2014
Institutions submit 2015-17 capital budget request to OFM	**September 19, 2014**
Evaluation panel meeting #3: OFM presents scoring results to four-year institutions and other stakeholders; attendance optional	September 22-28, 2014
OFM releases results to Council of Presidents, legislative fiscal committees and four-year institutions	**October 1, 2014 ***
Evaluation of 2015-17 process	November 19-30, 2014
Governor's budget proposal transmitted to Legislature	No later than December 20, 2014 *

* Date required by statute.

Contact: Christine Thomas, Capital Budget Assistant to the Governor, Office of Financial Management, (360) 902-3068, Fax (360) 664-8941, christine.thomas@ofm.wa.gov.

Chapter 2

Project Evaluation Framework and Categories

SCORING FRAMEWORK

Capital Requests. Each institution should develop a capital request based upon program-based strategic planning and facility master planning. As required by Chapter 43.88D RCW, each institution should submit a single prioritized list of proposed projects for the ensuing six-year period.

Once projects are selected internally, institutions should submit a project proposal for any project expected to have a cumulative total cost of more than $2 million during the three biennia beginning in 2015-17. Projects that have already been funded for design do not need to submit a project proposal unless the design process has resulted in a significant change in project scope, schedule, or cost from documents previously submitted to OFM and the Legislature; or if the project score is more than two biennia old. Institutions should consult with the OFM higher education capital budget analyst about whether a change is significant enough to require that a new or amended proposal be submitted.

Based upon the project's primary purpose, the institution must identify the particular category (predesign, growth, renovation, replacement, research, infrastructure or acquisition) within which it recommends the project be evaluated. Many projects address multiple evaluation categories; for example, both renovation and enrollment growth, or both enrollment growth and research. In such cases, a useful rule of thumb is to assign the project to the category purpose that comprises the majority of project square footage and/or cost. Institutions are encouraged to consult with OFM for questions about project classification.

The institution also shall indicate whether the project is a major project or a stand-alone project. A major project is a project with a total cumulative cost of more than $5 million and generally takes two to three biennia to complete. A stand-alone project is one with a total cumulative cost of between $2 million and $5 million and is generally completed within one biennium. Stand-alone projects will be evaluated as a subcategory under the relevant major category of growth, renovation, replacement or research.

The project proposal must specifically address the evaluation criteria. Agencies must provide a clear and accurate description of the facility need or problem addressed by the project, and a thoughtful analysis of the suggested option to meet the need or solve the problem. Each institution should be prepared to make a strong case that its project is in the best interest of the state.

A predesign completed in accordance with the OFM Predesign Manual must be on file with OFM by July 1, 2014, for any project for which the institution is seeking design funding during 2015-17. Minor works are not subject to this process and will not be scored or evaluated. Institutions should refer to the 2015-25 Capital Budget Instructions issued by OFM for further guidance.

Evaluation. Each project will be evaluated and scored within one of the seven defined categories. It is important to point out that in terms of total scores, capital projects requesting design funding will be compared to each other only within a category and will not be compared across categories (e.g., growth projects will only be compared to growth projects and not to renovation projects). Furthermore, major and stand-alone projects will be considered separately within a category. The system has not been designed to compare projects across categories and attempts to do so would be inherently flawed.

After all of the capital project requests have been scored, OFM will assemble them into a ranked list by category. The Governor and the Legislature will use the rankings generated by the Higher Education Project Evaluation process to inform and guide development of their capital budget proposals for 2015-17 and subsequent biennia.

The evaluation and scoring process has two levels:

- Overarching criteria: applicable to all project categories except infrastructure, acquisition and the stand-alone subcategories.
- Category-specific criteria: applicable within each of the seven categories.

CAPITAL PROJECT CATEGORIES AND DEFINITIONS

Exhibits A, B, and **C** present a summary of the capital project evaluation categories and scoring criteria. Each capital project request should be made exclusively within one of the seven categories, based on the institution's assessment of the project's primary purpose. Projects whose primary purpose is research or economic development should be included within the research category, even if these projects are renovations or replacements. In assigning projects that serve both the research and the instructional missions, consider the percentage of assignable square feet allocated to each mission. Institutions are encouraged to consult with OFM for questions about project classification.

Each major capital project request should be made exclusively within one of these seven categories:

- predesign requests
- growth
- renovation
- replacement
- research
- infrastructure
- acquisition

The project categories are based on the following definitions.

Predesign Request. Projects that define the scope of a discrete set of problems and needs, and that identify and assess the relative value of alternative capital budget solutions likely to cost $10 million or more to implement, should be requested in the Predesign category.

Growth. Projects whose primary purpose is to accommodate enrollment growth increases at main and branch campuses, at existing or new university centers, or through distance learning should be requested in this category. Growth projects should provide significant additional student capacity. Proposed projects must demonstrate that they are based on solid enrollment demand projections; provide enrollment access more cost-effectively than alternatives, such as university centers and distance learning; and make cost-effective use of existing and proposed new space. Land acquisition associated with a specific growth request should be included as an element of the project request in this category.

Renovation. Projects that renovate facilities to restore building life and upgrade space to meet current program requirements should be requested in this category. Renovation projects should represent a complete renovation of a total facility or an isolated wing of a facility. A reasonable renovation project should cost between 60 to 80 percent of current replacement value and restore the renovated area to at

least 25 years of useful life. New space may be programmed for the same or a different use than the space being renovated, and may include additions to improve access and enhance the relationship of program or support space.

Replacement. Facilities that cannot be economically renovated are considered replacement projects. New space may be programmed for the same or a different use than the space being replaced, and may include additions to improve access and enhance the relationship of program or support space.

Research. Projects whose primary purpose is to promote research should be proposed in this category, even if the project involves renovation or replacement of an existing facility. The acquisition and installation of specialized equipment is also authorized under this category.

Infrastructure. This category is intended for major stand-alone campus infrastructure projects that exceed the minor works threshold limit of $2 million. These projects may be inside or outside of a building. Examples of infrastructure projects include the replacement of an electrical system, a steam tunnel or a renovation project that does not extend the useful life of the area by 25 years. These projects generally would be funded for predesign through construction in one biennium.

Acquisition. This category is intended for the acquisition or clean-up of land for which no specific facility project is being proposed at this time. This category also includes acquisition of facilities and/or land with built improvements. Land acquisition needed for a specific facility should be included in the category most closely associated with the facility.

EXHIBIT A: DESIGN REQUESTS – MAJOR PROJECTS

GROWTH RENOVATION REPLACEMENT RESEARCH

Overarching Evaluation Criteria

Integral to Achieving Statewide Policy Goals
(13 points possible)

Integral to Institution Planning and Goals
(8 points possible)

Total Points = 21

Institutional Priority Points

10 points possible – apply once across growth, renovation, replacement and research categories
(1st priority = 10 points, 2nd priority = 8 points, 3rd priority = 6 points)

Evaluation Criteria	Max Points
Reasonableness of Cost	12
Availability of Space	10
Efficiency of Space Allocation	5
Program-related Space Allocation	6
Enrollment Growth	20
Category Subtotal	**53**
Overarching Criteria	21
Priority Points	10
Total	**84**

Evaluation criteria	Max Points
Reasonableness of Cost	12
Availability of Space	10
Efficiency of Space Allocation	5
Program-related Space Allocation	6
Significant Health, Safety, and Code Issues	10
Adequacy of Space	5
Condition of Building	10
Age of Building Since Last Major Remodel	6
Category Subtotal	**64**
Overarching Criteria	21
Priority Points	10
Total	**95**

Evaluation criteria	Max Points
Reasonableness of Cost	12
Availability of Space	10
Efficiency of Space Allocation	5
Program-related Space Allocation	6
Significant Health, Safety, and Code Issues	10
Adequacy of Space	5
Condition of Building	10
Age of Building Since Last Major Remodel	6
Category Subtotal	**64**
Overarching Criteria	21
Priority Points	10
Total	**95**

Evaluation Criteria	Max Points
Reasonableness of Cost	12
Availability of Instructional Space	10
Availability of Research Space	5
Adequacy of Research Space	5
Impact on Economic Development	16
Impact on Innovation	10
Contribution of Other Funding Sources	10
Integral to Achieving Statewide Policy Goals	4
Category Subtotal	**71**
Overarching Criteria	21
Priority Points	10
Total	**102**

EXHIBIT B: STAND-ALONE PROJECTS

GROWTH RENOVATION REPLACEMENT RESEARCH

Institutional Priority Points

6 points possible – apply once across stand-alone projects within the growth, renovation, replacement and research categories
(1st priority = 6 points, 2nd priority = 4 points, 3rd priority = 2 points)

Evaluation Criteria	Max Points
Reasonableness of Cost	12
Availability of Space	10
Efficiency of Space Allocation	5
Program-related Space Allocation	6
Enrollment Growth	20
Category Subtotal	**53**
Priority Points	6
Total	**59**

Evaluation criteria	Max Points
Reasonableness of Cost	12
Availability of Space	10
Efficiency of Space Allocation	5
Program-related Space Allocation	6
Significant Health, Safety, and Code Issues	10
Adequacy of Space	5
Condition of Building	10
Age of Building Since Last Major Remodel	6
Category Subtotal	**64**
Priority Points	6
Total	**70**

Evaluation Criteria	Max Points
Reasonableness of Cost	12
Availability of Space	10
Efficiency of Space Allocation	5
Program-related Space Allocation	6
Significant Health, Safety, and Code Issues	10
Adequacy of Space	5
Condition of Building	10
Age of Building Since Last Major Remodel	6
Category Subtotal	**64**
Priority Points	6
Total	**70**

Evaluation Criteria	Max Points
Reasonableness of Cost	12
Availability of Instructional Space	10
Availability of Research Space	5
Adequacy of Research Space	5
Impact on Economic Development	16
Impact on Innovation	10
Contribution of Other Funding Sources	10
Integral to Achieving Statewide Policy Goals	4
Category Subtotal	71
Priority Points	6
Total	**77**

EXHIBIT C: PREDESIGN, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND ACQUISITION REQUESTS

Institutional Priority Points

6 points possible – apply once across predesign, infrastructure and acquisition categories
(1st priority = 6 points, 2nd priority = 4 points, 3rd priority =2 points)

PREDESIGN REQUESTS

Overarching criteria

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Points
Increase Bachelor's Degrees	4
Increase Bachelor's Degrees in High Demand Fields	4
Increase Advanced Degrees	4
Promotes Access	4
Integral to Master Plan	8
Integral to Academic Plan	4
Availability of Appropriate Space	10
Current Space Utilization	5
Condition of Building	10
Institutional Priority	6
Total	**64**

INFRASTRUCTURE

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Points
Reasonable Estimate	6
Evidence of Failure/Ability to Defer	6
Impact on University Operations without Infrastructure Project	6
Significant Health, Safety, and Code Issues	14
Engineering Study	6
Supports Facilities Plan	6
Resource Efficiency & Sustainability	9
Institutional Priority	6
Total	**59**

ACQUISITION

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Points
Reasonableness of Cost	15
Intended Use	6
Supported by Planning	15
Savings to Operating Costs	8
Buildable Percent (Land only or land with non-usable structures) **OR**	8
Building condition and percent of costs required to adapt building	8
Institutional Priority	6
Total	**58**

Chapter 3

Project Evaluation and Scoring Process

Evaluation Panel Structure

The project evaluation and scoring process that will be used for 2015-17 involves formation of Capital Project Evaluation Panels with representation from the following groups:

- Office of Financial Management – capital and operating budget sections
- Washington Student Achievement Council
- Department of Commerce
- Department of Enterprise Services
- Staff from four-year institutions – capital facilities and academic affairs

Each institution is asked to identify up to two individuals with capital facilities expertise and up to two individuals from academic affairs. Final composition will be determined by OFM in consultation with legislative staff.

Institutions also should nominate alternates in the event that a panel member is not able to serve. **Please note that it is critically important that the same panel member is able to attend both meetings #1 and #2.** If a panel member is unable to attend both of these meetings, his/her scoring will not be considered.

Organizational structure. The panels will be comprised of four or five individuals who will evaluate and score a subset of the projects. The panels will operate under these guidelines:

- The individuals will evaluate and score projects in one or more categories, depending upon proposal volume.
- Representatives from four-year institutions will not score their own projects.
- Members of each panel will review project proposals individually, and then meet to discuss and come to an agreement on the scoring.
- Panel facilitators will be comprised of OFM and legislative capital budget staff. Facilitators will participate ex officio in scoring discussions as non-voting members.

Evaluation Process Phases

The panels will work through a multi-part process that will take place in two meetings. A schedule will be released when finalized.

Meetings are typically two to four hours long. Facilitators will coordinate with their panel members to schedule meetings #1 and #2 within the dates indicated in the schedule in Chapter 1. Project scores will be released electronically after the public announcement.

Panel Meeting #1: overview and panel charge

- Overview and Q&A about the process, project categories and evaluation criteria
- "Example scoring" and development of a common understanding about definitions, criteria and scoring protocols
- Proposals will be distributed to panel members

OFM will distribute the project submittals to the panel members who will independently review them and note any questions they have about the proposals and how to apply the criteria. Panel members will forward any questions to the panel facilitator in advance of the second panel meeting. Institutions will then have the opportunity to respond to panel questions in writing prior to meeting #2. Proposals should be scored objectively based on information provided by the institutions through the submittals and responses to any follow-up questions. Panel members should come to meeting #2 having completed a preliminary scoring of the proposals.

Panel meeting #2: proposal review and scoring

- Discuss application of criteria to project proposals generally
- Review institutions' responses to panel members' questions
- Review preliminary scores of assigned project proposals
- Score assigned project proposals

The purpose of this phase is to determine a score for each project within each category. The panel members will meet to assign scores to each project under their review.

Presentation of scoring results

OFM will debrief and present scoring results to four-year institutions and other stakeholders; attendance is optional.

EVALUATION PROCESS

Evaluation and scoring process objectives. The evaluation process has the following objectives:

- Provide decision-makers with comprehensive and accurate analysis of the relative value of potential capital projects.
- Conduct a transparent, fair and understandable project review process.
- Provide comparable information across multiple institutions and projects.
- Respond to legislative direction to OFM to coordinate the evaluation and scoring of capital facility project requests.

Question and answer period. Between June 1 and July 1, 2014, institutions may submit written questions to OFM, which will post responses on its website generally within two working days.

Resolve Tie Scores. If necessary, two (or more) small groups will meet jointly to resolve any tie scores within the same category. OFM will then compile the individual scores.

Product. Panel members will return scoring results to OFM for compilation.

Scoring. Project scores, prioritized within each category, will be released to the legislative fiscal committees, the Washington Student Achievement Council (WSAC) and institutions by October 1, 2014. OFM will hold meetings with each institution to explain the scoring and debrief about the process at the request of the institution.

PROCESS DEBRIEF AND REVIEW

The purpose of this final phase is to improve the process for the next biennium. Once the legislative session is over and capital projects have been selected for funding, OFM will ask participants to provide feedback, identify strengths and weaknesses, and recommend changes. Institutions and other stakeholders will have an opportunity to comment and provide suggestions regarding process, categories and evaluation criteria.

Chapter 4

Project Proposal: Submittal Guidelines

Project Proposal Submittal and Due Date

- Submittals are limited to **10 pages** (excluding project cost, diagrams and sketches, appendices, cover sheet, title page and table of contents). Submit proposals in loose-leaf form with binder clips. Do not submit proposals in three-ring binders or with comb bindings.
- Each project proposal should be submitted within a single project category; do not submit minor works projects for this scoring process.
- A confidential institutional priority form (one per institution) will be **submitted under separate cover directly to the OFM higher education capital budget analyst**, either electronically or mailed in a clearly labeled envelope. This form can be found on the OFM website.
- A signed checklist (one per proposal) must be submitted. This form can be found at OFM website.
- Institutions should **submit 10 copies to OFM**, along with an electronic copy of the request. Please create a separate .pdf document for each proposal submitted.
- Submittals are due to OFM by 5 p.m. on **August 15, 2014**. Submit electronic copies to Christine Thomas.

Proposal Format

Project proposals should be organized in four parts:

- Brief summary description of the project
- Overarching evaluation criteria (where applicable): how the project addresses the statewide and the institutional planning criteria
- Category-specific information: how the project addresses each individual evaluation criterion within the category
- Appendices: supplemental and supporting documentation, including technical exhibits

Content Instructions

Each project proposal should address the following elements.

Summary Narrative: Project Scope and Description.

Succinctly describe the proposed project, including the following information:

- Category and subcategory of project request
- Problem statement, short description of the project — the needs, benefits, and consequences of not doing the project
- History of the project or facility
- Programs addressed or encompassed by the project

Refer to the matrices in Exhibits D and E that indicate which criteria apply to each category. For additional detail on the evaluation criteria and the associated scoring, see Chapter 6.

EXHIBIT D: CRITERIA MATRIX: GROWTH, RENOVATION, REPLACEMENT AND RESEARCH

	Category:	Growth		Renovation		Replacement		Research	
	Criteria	**Major**	**Stand-Alone**	**Major**	**Stand-Alone**	**Major**	**Stand-Alone**	**Major**	**Stand-Alone**
Over-arching	Increases number of bachelor's degrees	X		X		X		X	
	Increases number of bachelor's degrees in high demand fields	X		X		X		X	
	Increases number of advanced degrees	X		X		X		X	
	Promotes access	X		X		X		X	
	Integral to campus/facilities master plan	X		X		X		X	
	Integral to institution's academic plan	X		X		X		X	
	Adequacy of available space			X	X	X	X	X	X
	Availability of space in relation to HECB utilization standards	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Building condition			X	X	X	X		
	Enrollment growth	X	X						
	Efficiency of space allocation in relation to FEPG	X	X	X	X	X	X		

EXHIBIT D: CRITERIA MATRIX: GROWTH, RENOVATION, REPLACEMENT AND RESEARCH (CONTINUED)

Category:	Growth		Renovation		Replacement		Research	
Criteria	**Major**	**Stand-Alone**	**Major**	**Stand-Alone**	**Major**	**Stand-Alone**	**Major**	**Stand-Alone**
Meets building efficiency guidelines (ASF/GSF)	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Reasonableness of cost	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Program-related space allocation	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Age of building since last major remodel			X	X	X	X		
Significant health, safety and code issues			X	X	X	X		
Impact on economic developments							X	X
Impact on innovation							X	X
Other funding sources							X	X

EXHIBIT E: CRITERIA MATRIX: PREDESIGN, INFRASTRUCTURE AND ACQUISITION

	Category:			
	Criteria	**Predesign**	**Infrastructure**	**Acquisition**
Over-arching	Increases number of bachelor's degrees awarded	X		
	Increases number of bachelor's degrees awarded in high demand fields	X		
	Increases number of advanced degrees	X		
	Promotes access	X		
	Integral to campus/facilities master plan	X	X	X
	Integral to institution's academic plan	X	X	X
	Appropriateness/adequacy of available space	X		
	Availability of space in relation to HECB utilization standards	X		
	Building condition	X		X
	Reasonableness of cost		X	X
	Significant health, safety and code issues		X	
	Evidence of increased repairs/service interruption		X	
	Impact on operations without project		X	
	Engineering study		X	
	Resource efficiency and sustainability		X	
	Intended use			X
	Percentage of buildable area			X
	Capital improvements required to adapt existing facility to proposed use			X
	Savings to operating costs			X

Evaluation Criteria. Submittals should demonstrate how the project addresses the overarching capital project evaluation criteria.

Integral to Achieving Statewide Policy Goals. Identify the statewide goal or goals the project is expected to address, and describe how and the specific extent to which it will do so.

Integral to Institutional Planning and Goals. Describe the proposed project's relationship and relative importance to the institution's campus master/facilities plan and strategic plan.

Several of the statewide goals relate to increasing the number of degrees awarded, specifically bachelor's degrees, bachelor's degrees in high-demand fields, and advanced degrees. As defined in the former HECB Strategic Master Plan Update 2012 found at http://www.hecb.wa.gov/sites/default/files/SMP2012Update.pdf, high-demand fields are technology, engineering, science, mathematics and health care.

Adequacy of Space. Describe the extent to which the project is needed to meet current pedagogical standards and program needs, and how it would accomplish that.

Space Utilization. Identify the average number of hours per week that each classroom seat and classroom lab is expected to be utilized in fall 2014 on the proposed project's campus. If the campus does not meet the former HECB utilization standards of 22 hours per classroom seat and/or the 16 hours per class lab, describe any institutional plans for achieving that level of utilization.

Fall 2014 utilization should be estimated by taking fall 2013 actual enrollment and increasing it by the percentage by which academic year 2014-2015 state-supported enrollment is budgeted to exceed academic year 2014 budgeted enrollment.

Building Condition. Pending results of the 2014 Comparable Framework Report by Meng Analysis due later this year, provide the facility's most recent condition score (1 superior–5 marginal functionality) from the 2010 Comparable Framework study and summarize the major structural and systems conditions that resulted in that score. Provide selected supporting documentation in appendices and reference them in the body of the proposal. OFM will update the facility's condition score once the report is submitted to OFM.

For renovation projects only, identify whether the building is listed on the Washington Heritage Register, and if so, summarize its historic significance.

> *Note:* This criterion is scored differently in the renovation and replacement categories. In renovation, points are weighted more towards buildings in fair condition because buildings at the low end of the condition should be replaced rather than renovated with the exception of those designated for historic preservation. Buildings listed on the Washington Heritage Register with building condition scores of three, four or five will receive additional points in scoring.

Efficiency of Space Allocation. For each major function in the proposed facility (classroom, instructional labs, offices), identify whether space allocations will be consistent with Facility Evaluation and Planning Guide (FEPG) assignable square feet standards. If any proposed allocations exceed FEPG standards, explain the alternative standard that has been used and why. See the FEPG at http://www.hecb.wa.gov/sites/default/files/FacilitiesEvaluationandPlanningGuide.pdf.

Example: Efficiency of Space Allocation – FEPG Standard

FEPG Room Classification No.	FEPG Room Classification Type	Project ASF per Station	FEPG Standard	Meets Standard (Y/N)	Comments
110	Classroom	20	16-26	Y	
110	Classroom	30	16-26	N	Exceeds standards due to programmatic need for demonstration space
210	Class lab - physical sciences	70	40-90	Y	
215	Class lab service	-	-	N/A	Sized appropriately to serve two labs
230	Computer lab	45	60	N	Falls below FEPG guideline, but meets programming needs
250	Research lab	80	-	N/A	Sized for research program needs
255	Research lab service	-	-	N/A	Sized appropriately to serve research labs
311	Faculty office	140	140	Y	
311 & 312	Faculty chair office	175	175	Y	
311 & 312	Dean's office	200	200	Y	
313	Student assistants office	140 per 4	140 per 2 min.	Y	4 student assistants = 2 FTE
314	Clerical office	140	140	Y	2 FTE
315	Office service, clerical station	100	100	Y	2 FTE
316 & 317	Staff & other office	120	120	Y	
350	Conference room	300	310	N	Total SF shown; FEPG = Total Office Area/12; project SF insignificant amount below standard, still meets FEPG guideline of 20 SF per station
610	Auditorium/ lecture hall	20	15-16	N	Additional SF needed to meet ADA requirements due to site conditions
760	Hazardous material storage	-	As appropriate by code	N/A	Sized appropriately to serve labs
770	Hazardous waste storage	-	As appropriate by code	N/A	Sized appropriately to serve labs

Identify the (a) assignable square feet in the proposed facility; (b) the gross square feet; and (c) the net building efficiency ("a" divided by "b").

Reasonableness of cost. Provide the Capital Budgeting System (CBS) report CBS002 and cost estimate CBS003 for the entire project regardless of fund source plus as much detailed cost information as is available. This information is required but not scored for predesign requests.

Program-related space allocation. Identify planned use of proposed space, including assignable square footages by use type. Below is an example.

Type of Space	Points	Assignable Square Feet	Percentage of total	Score = Points x Percentage
Instructional space (classroom, lab, library)	6	88,483	88.4	5.3
Student advising/counseling	4	-	0.0	0.0
Childcare	4	-	0.0	0.0
Faculty offices	4	6,729	6.7	0.3
Administrative	2	3,805	3.8	0.1
Maintenance/central stores/student center	2	1,073	1.1	0.0
Total		**100,090**	**100.0**	**5.7**

Age of building since last major remodel (renovation and replacement categories). Identify the number of years since the last substantial renovation of the facility. If only one portion of a building is to be remodeled, provide the age of that portion only. If the project involves multiple wings of a building that were constructed or renovated at different times, calculate and provide a weighted average facility age, based upon the gross square feet and age of each wing.

Significant health, safety and code issues. Identify whether the project is needed to bring the facility within current seismic, life safety, ADA or energy code requirements. Clearly identify the applicable standard or code, and describe how the project will improve consistency with it. Cite examples of existing conditions that do not comply with current codes that the project will correct. Provide selected supporting documentation in appendices and reference them in the body of the proposal.

Enrollment growth (growth category). Identify the number of additional full-time equivalent (FTE) state-supported students the project is expected to enable the institution to serve when the space is fully occupied. Describe the method by which the number of additional FTEs has been calculated, and provide and explain the enrollment analysis indicating probable student demand and enrollment from project completion to full occupancy.

> *Note:* Points will be awarded based on the following equation: (# of projected FTEs)/300 x 15. A maximum of 15 points will be given to a project that adds capacity for 300 or more additional state-supported FTEs.

Identify how many of the additional FTE enrollments are expected to be in high-demand fields, as defined by the former HECB, and the particular fields in which such growth is expected to occur.

Impact on economic development (research category). Identify any specific state, regional or local economic development plans associated with the project and describe how it would support them. Demonstrate that federal or private funding is likely to be available to support the research that would be conducted in the facility. Summarize and quantify the expected economic benefits of the project and provide selected supporting documentation in a clearly referenced appendix.

Impact on innovation (research category). Explain how the research activities proposed for the project will advance areas of existing preeminence or position the institution for preeminence in a field or area. Evidence of existing or potential research preeminence could include, but is not limited to, funding history, faculty qualifications, publications, patents, business spin-offs, etc.

Availability of research space (research category). Describe the extent to which there is sufficient space (square footage) in existing campus facilities to conduct the proposed research.

Adequacy of research space (research category). Describe how and the extent to which existing campus facilities are inadequate to conduct the proposed research.

Contribution of other funding sources (research category). Identify the source and amount of capital planning and construction costs that will be covered by sources other than state tax or building fund appropriations. Provide supporting documentation demonstrating the likelihood that such non-state revenues are likely to be available and any restrictions on their use.

CRITERIA SPECIFIC TO THE INFRASTRUCTURE CATEGORY

Evidence of increased repairs and/or service interruption. Identify prior repairs and/or service interruption beyond routine preventive maintenance activities. Describe increasing utility and/or maintenance costs and/or system unreliability. Address the impact of deferring the project. Provide selected supporting documentation in appendices and reference them in the body of the proposal. Examples of supporting documentation includes, but is not limited to, work order history on repairs, number of call-outs to outside contractors to address a specific problem, utility bills demonstrating increased costs over time due to an issue that needs to be corrected, evidence of cessation of services due to required repair(s), etc.

Impact on institutional operations without infrastructure project. Describe the impact to existing operations or impact to funded or planned construction projects should this infrastructure project not occur.

Engineering study. Identify whether there is a completed comprehensive engineering study, site survey and recommendations, or opinion letter. Provide referenced supporting documentation in appendices.

Reasonable estimate. Provide a recent, detailed cost estimate prepared by specialty professionals applicable to the scope of work or an experienced project manager.

Resource efficiency and sustainability. Document project benefits associated with low-impact development, improvements in energy and resource conservation, and use of renewable energy sources. "Low impact development" refers to an approach to land development that works with nature to manage stormwater as close to its source as possible. Examples include bio-retention facilities, rain gardens, vegetated rooftops, rain barrels and permeable pavements. "Renewable" energy systems include, but are not limited to, hydroelectric power, active or passive solar space

heating or cooling, domestic solar water heating, windmills, waste heat, biomass and/or refuse-derived fuels, photovoltaic devices and geothermal energy.

CRITERIA SPECIFIC TO THE ACQUISITION CATEGORY

Reasonableness of cost. Provide an appraisal of the land and/or facility to be acquired or an estimate of the state's liability for cleanup of the land that is already owned. In addition to the appraisal, provide costs for two comparable acquisitions in the same area. Provide the Capital Budgeting System (CBS) cost estimate (CBS003 report) for the entire project regardless of fund source plus as much detailed cost information that is available based on the project phase.

Intended use. Indicate the intended use of the property, whether for instructional building, non-instructional building or other.

Percentage of buildable area. For land acquisitions with non-usable structures, indicate the percentage of the total property that is suitable for development based on the results of an environmental review and engineering inspection of the property. Address the suitability of the property in terms of condition and location.

Building condition. For facility acquisitions or land acquisitions with usable facilities, indicate the condition of the facility using the methodology prescribed in the 2010 Comparable Framework Study as evaluated by an architect or engineer.

Capital improvements required. For facility acquisitions, provide a cost estimate for the funds required to adapt the facility to the proposed use.

Savings to operating costs. Submit calculations demonstrating any savings to operating costs due to the acquisition. Present the savings in terms of years of payback of the cost of the acquisition.

INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITY POINTS

Institutional priority points will be submitted separately to the OFM higher education budget analyst and will remain confidential until after the evaluation panels have completed the scoring. This is to ensure an objective evaluation of projects on their own merits.

Predesign requests, infrastructure projects and acquisitions are eligible for allocation of priority points among the institution's top three projects in these categories. Institutional priority points equal approximately 10 percent of a given category. A project can receive a maximum of six points in this category: six for first priority, four for second priority and two for the third priority.

Institutions may also apply priority points to design requests for major projects. These would be allocated to the institution's top three projects in the growth, renovation, replacement and research categories. Again, the institutional priority points equal approximately 10 percent of the maximum point in a given category. In the design categories, a project can receive a maximum of 10 points: 10 for first priority, eight for second priority and six for third priority.

Priority points are available to stand-alone projects submitted under the categories of growth, renovation, replacement, and research. A project can receive a maximum of six points in this category: six for first priority, four for second priority and two for the third priority.

APPENDICES

Supplemental and supporting project documentation, limited to materials directly related to the evaluation criteria, such as:

- Capital Project Request CBS002 and Project Cost Estimate CBS003 reports (required for each project proposal)
- Degree and enrollment growth projections
- Selected excerpts from institutional plans
- Efficiency of space allocation chart
- Data on instructional and/or research space utilization
- Additional documentation for selected cost comparables
- Selected materials on facility conditions
- Selected materials on code compliance
- Tables supporting calculation of program space allocations, weighted average facility age, etc.
- Evidence of consistency of proposed research projects with state, regional or local economic development plans
- Evidence of availability of non-state matching funds
- Selected documentation of prior facility failures, high cost maintenance and/or system unreliability for infrastructure projects
- Documentation of professional assessment of costs for land acquisition, land cleanup and infrastructure projects
- Selected documentation of engineering studies, site survey and recommendations or opinion letters for infrastructure and land cleanup projects

Chapter 5

Project Cost Standards

Expected Project Cost Range in 2008 Dollars

The following data is from the Facilities Financing Study prepared by Berk & Associates in December 2008 (http://www.ofm.wa.gov/budget/capital/higher_ed_capital_finance_study.pdf). This study was directed by the 2008 Legislature in Engrossed Substitute House Bill 3329.

		Construction Costs / GSF		Total Project Costs / GSF
Facility Type	Number of Data Points	Standard Deviation	Best Fit	Expected Cost
Classrooms	19	57.36	$297	$420
Communications buildings	5	68.28	$267	$378
Science labs (teaching)	16	65.59	$309	$437
Research facilities	12	61.31	$440	$623
Administrative buildings	9	36.20	$218	$309
Day care facilities	4	23.72	$199	$283
Libraries	6	59.44	$237	$336

Construction Cost Index 2014

The following data is based on the April 2014 Global Insight forecast for state and local government spending and is to be used for adjusting the expected costs from July 1, 2008 to the mid-construction date for comparison to project estimates.

Mid-construction Date	Construction Index	Mid-construction Date	Construction Index	Mid-construction Date	Construction Index	Mid-construction Date	Construction Index
7/1/2008	1.000	11/15/2011	1.082	2/14/2015	1.191	8/16/2018	1.326
8/15/2008	1.011	2/14/2012	1.091	5/16/2015	1.200	11/15/2018	1.335
11/14/2008	1.027	5/15/2012	1.099	8/16/2015	1.209	2/14/2019	1.343
2/14/2009	1.026	8/15/2012	1.104	11/15/2015	1.218	5/16/2019	1.351
5/16/2009	1.016	11/14/2012	1.109	2/14/2016	1.227	8/16/2019	1.358
8/16/2009	1.010	2/14/2013	1.116	5/15/2016	1.238	11/15/2019	1.366
11/15/2009	1.012	5/16/2013	1.122	8/15/2016	1.248	2/14/2020	1.373
2/14/2010	1.017	8/16/2013	1.130	11/14/2016	1.259	5/15/2020	1.380
5/16/2010	1.022	11/15/2013	1.140	2/14/2017	1.270	8/15/2020	1.387
8/16/2010	1.028	2/14/2014	1.151	5/16/2017	1.280	11/14/2020	1.394
11/15/2010	1.035	5/16/2014	1.162	8/16/2017	1.290	2/14/2021	1.402
2/14/2011	1.044	7/1/2014	1.167	11/15/2017	1.299	5/15/2021	1.409
5/16/2011	1.057	8/16/2014	1.172	2/14/2018	1.309	8/15/2021	1.416
8/16/2011	1.071	11/15/2014	1.182	5/16/2018	1.317	11/14/2021	1.424

ADJUSTMENT OF EXPECTED COST RANGES

Here is an example of how to determine the expected cost range for a specific project:

Facility Type: Classrooms

Construction Dates: **Start:** September 1, 2015 (from CBS003)
End: June 1, 2017 (from CBS003)
Mid-point: July 16, 2016 (calculated)

Construction Index for Mid-point: 1.245 (interpolated from index table: (1.248-1.238)*2/3+1.238)

Expected Total Project GSF Cost in 2008 Dollars: $420 (from expected cost table)

Expected Total Project GSF Cost at Construction Bid

Chapter 6

Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Standards for Capital Projects

Minimum Thresholds

Proposed capital projects must pass the following minimum thresholds before being evaluated.

All categories, except infrastructure and land:

- Project is not an exclusive enterprise function such as a bookstore, dormitory or contract food service.
- Project meets LEED Silver Standard requirements.
- Institution has a greenhouse gas and vehicle emissions reduction policy in place.

All design requests. A completed predesign study, completed in accordance with the OFM predesign manual, has been submitted to OFM by July 1, 2014.

Renovation requests. Project extends the useful life of the facility by at least 25 years.

Stand-alone projects, infrastructure and acquisition. The request is a single project funded in one biennium.

Institutional Priority Points

Institutions may apply priority points to their project proposals as outlined below. An institution's prioritization shall be submitted directly to the OFM Higher Education Capital Budget Analyst, separately from project proposals. You will find the Institutional Priority Form on OFM's website.

Design requests – major projects. For all major project proposals submitted in the following four categories of Growth, Renovation, Replacement, and Research, institutions may identify their top three highest priority projects. The first priority project shall receive 10 points; second priority, eight points; and third priority, six points.

Stand-alone projects. For all stand-alone project proposals submitted in the following four categories of growth, renovation, replacement and research, institutions may identify their top three highest priority projects. The first priority project shall receive six points; second priority, four points; and third priority, two points.

Predesign, infrastructure and acquisition projects. Among these categories, institutions may identify their top three highest priority projects. The first priority project shall receive six points; second priority, four points; and third priority, two points.

The following is an example of how an institution's prioritization might look.

Design Requests - Major Projects			
	Project Name	**Category**	**Points**
1st Priority	Major Project B	Renovation	10
2nd Priority	Major Project D	Growth	8
3rd Priority	Major Project A	Replacement	6
Stand-alone Projects			
	Project Name	**Category**	**Points**
1st Priority	Stand-alone Project C	Growth	6
2nd Priority	Stand-alone Project A	Renovation	4
3rd Priority	Stand-alone Project B	Renovation	2
Predesign, Infrastructure, And Acquisition Requests			
	Project Name	**Category**	**Points**
1st Priority	Campus Electrical System Upgrade/Replacement	Infrastructure	6
2nd Priority	Major College Building Predesign	Predesign	4
3rd Priority	Land Acquisition	Acquisition	2

OVERARCHING EVALUATION CRITERIA (APPLIES TO MAJOR PROJECT REQUESTS)

These overarching evaluation criteria have been identified:

1. Integral to achieving statewide policy goals.
2. Integral to institutional planning and goals.

These criteria reflect the Legislature's intent to align capital project funding with statewide and institutional policy goals. They represent 21 total possible points. Definitions and scoring standards for each criterion are displayed in the table below. They have been designed to apply to all project categories except infrastructure, acquisition and stand-alone projects.

OVERARCHING EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Integral to achieving statewide policy goals (13 points possible)	**Promotes achievement of statewide goals established in former HECB strategic master plan or enacted legislation.**	
	Increases number of bachelor's degrees awarded beyond 2015 level specified in institution's former HECB/OFM performance measures. Institutions to provide (a) number of bachelor's degrees awarded at the close of 2012-13 academic year, and (b) number of bachelor's degrees targeted for 2015.	**Up to 3**
	If a/b >= 100%	0
	If 75% <= a/b < 100%	1
	If 50% <= a/b < 75%	2
	If a/b < 50%	3
	Increases number of bachelor's degrees awarded in high-demand fields beyond 2015 level specified in institution's former HECB/OFM performance measures. Institutions to provide (a) number of bachelor's degrees awarded in high-demand fields at the close of 2012-13 academic year, and (b) number of bachelor's degrees in high-demand fields targeted for 2015.	**Up to 3**
	If a/b >= 100%	0
	If 75% <= a/b < 100%	1
	If 50% <= a/b < 75%	2
	If a/b < 50%	3
	Increases number of advanced degrees awarded beyond 2015 level specified in institution's former HECB/OFM performance measures. Institutions to provide (a) number of advanced degrees awarded at the close of 2012-13 academic year, and (b) number of advanced degrees targeted for 2015.	**Up to 3**
	If a/b >= 100%	0
	If 75% <= a/b < 100%	1
	If 50% <= a/b < 75%	2
	If a/b < 50%	3
	Promotes access for underserved regions and place-bound adults through distance learning and/or university centers.	**Up to 4**
	Is distance learning or a university center a large and significant component of the total project scope?	Up to 2
	Is the project likely to enroll a significant number of students who are place-bound or residents of underserved regions?	Up to 2

Integral to institutional planning and goals (8 points possible)	**Achieves institutional planning goals and objectives.**	**Additive**
	Integral to campus/facilities master plan. Project must be initiated soon to sustain institutional program(s) and meet current demand for those program(s).	**Up to 4:**
	• Has the project been identified in the most recent campus/facilities master plan?	Up to 2
	• Does the project following the sequencing laid out in the master plan? If not, explain why it is being requested now.	Up to 2
	Integral to institution's academic programs plan. Project must be initiated soon to implement successive measures of the academic plan to meet projected program requirements, growth of existing programs or demand for new programs.	**Up to 4:**
	• Must the project be initiated soon in order to meet academic certification requirements?	Up to 2
	• To permit enrollment growth and/or specific quality improvements in current programs?	Up to 1
	• To permit initiation of new programs?	Up to 1

GROWTH CATEGORY CRITERIA

Access-related projects to accommodate enrollment growth.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Enrollment growth (20 points possible)	Project adds capacity for state-supported enrollment growth. Points calculated according to the following equation, with maximum points given to a project providing capacity for 300 or more additional FTEs: (# of projected FTEs)/300 x 15 = total number of points.	Proportional; up to 15 points
	Growth is in high-demand fields: biological and biomedical sciences; computer and information sciences; education with specializations in special education, math or science; engineering and engineering technology; health professions and related clinical sciences; or mathematics and statistics.	Up to 5
Availability of space (10 points possible)	**Addresses insufficient space on campus to accommodate projected enrollment growth.**	**Select one**
	Adds classroom space on a campus that currently exceeds the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and adds class laboratory space to a campus that exceeds the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard.	1-2
	Adds classroom space on a campus that does not exceed the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of classroom space.	Up to 5
	Adds class laboratory space on a campus that does not exceed the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of class laboratories.	Up to 5
	Adds space on a campus that does not meet HECB utilization standards and has no plan to achieve them and/or project has no impact on classroom or class laboratory utilization standards.	0
Efficiency of space allocation (5 points possible)	**Proposed space allocations are consistent with FEPG benchmarks or other appropriate benchmark.**	**Select one**
	Project demonstrates consistency with space standards in FEPG benchmarks.	3
	Project is not consistent with FEPG benchmarks, but: (1) proposes alternative standards; (2) makes a compelling case why those standards are more applicable to the proposed project than former HECB space standards; and (3) documents proposed space use against those standards.	Up to 3
	Project is not consistent with FEPG or other benchmarks.	0
	Proposed space allocations are consistent with building efficiency guidelines (ASF/GSF).	**Select one**
	More than 65% (science building more than 60%)	2
	60% – 65% (science building 55% – 60%)	1
	Less than 60% (science building less than 55%)	0

Reasonableness of cost (12 points possible)	**Consistency with OFM cost standards.**	**Additive; up to 12 points**
	Total project cost is less than or equal to the expected cost per square foot for the facility type, escalated to the construction mid-point.	7 – 10
	Project cost is between 100% and 111% of expected cost.	4 – 6
	Project cost is between 111% and 137% of expected cost.	1 – 3
	Project cost is more than 137% of expected cost.	Up to 2
	Demonstrates that project provides more cost-effective enrollment access than alternatives such as university centers and distance learning.	Select Yes (2)/No (0)
Program-related space allocation (weighted average, 6 points possible)	**Assignable square feet. Percentage of total x points = score**	**Points**
	Instructional space (classroom, lab, library)	6
	Student advising/counseling services	4
	Child care	4
	Faculty offices	4
	Administrative	2
	Maintenance/central stores/student center	2
		= Total Score

RENOVATION CATEGORY CRITERIA

Projects that renovate buildings (or distinct portions of buildings) to extend facility life and upgrade space for program requirements.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Age of building since last major remodel (6 points possible)	**Age of building or portion proposed for renovation since last major remodel. For renovation projects with areas of differing ages, calculate a weighted average age based on square feet.**	**Select one**
	More than 40 years	6
	31 – 40 years	4
	20 – 30 years	2
	Less than 20 years	0
Availability of space (10 points possible)	**Project renovates space on campus that meets or exceeds existing HECB utilization standards.**	**Select one**
	Renovates classroom space on a campus that currently exceeds the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and renovates class laboratory space to a campus that exceeds the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard.	1 – 2
	Renovates classroom space on a campus that does not exceed the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of classroom space.	Up to 5
	Renovates class laboratory space on a campus that does not exceed the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of class laboratories.	Up to 5
	Renovates space on a campus that does not meet HECB utilization standards and has no plan to achieve them and/or project has no impact on classroom or class laboratory utilization standards.	0
Condition of building or portion proposed for renovation (10 points possible)	**Building condition per 2014 comparable framework.**	**Select one**
	Superior (condition score 1)	0
	Adequate (condition score 2)	4
	Fair (condition score 3)	8
	Needs Improvement — Limited Functionality (condition score 4)	6
	Needs Improvement — Marginal Functionality (condition score 5)	2
	Buildings of historic significance listed on Washington Heritage Register, with condition scores 3, 4 or 5	Additional 2

Significant health, safety and code issues (10 points possible)	**Project improves one or more of the following areas by bringing it within current standards or applicable codes (provide supporting documentation).**	**Additive**
	Life safety (cite applicable code and issue)	Up to 4
	Seismic	Up to 2
	ADA access	Up to 2
	Energy code	Up to 2
Reasonableness of cost (12 points possible)	**Consistency with OFM cost standards.**	**Select one**
	Total project cost is between 60% and 80% of expected cost for new construction of the facility type, escalated to the construction mid-point.	8 – 12
	Project cost is between 80% and 90% of expected cost.	6 – 7
	Project cost is between 90% and 109% of expected cost.	1 – 5
	Project cost is more than 109% of expected cost.	0
Efficiency of space allocation (5 points possible)	**Proposed space allocations are consistent with FEPG benchmarks or sufficient explanation is provided.**	**Select one**
	Project demonstrates consistency with space standards in FEPG benchmark.	3
	Project is not consistent with FEPG benchmarks, but: (1) proposes alternative standards; (2) makes a compelling case why those standards are more applicable to the proposed project than HECB space standards; and (3) documents proposed space use against those standards.	Up to 3
	Project is not consistent with FEPG or other benchmarks.	0
	Proposed space allocations are consistent with building efficiency guidelines (ASF/GSF).	**Select one**
	More than 65% (science building more than 60%)	2
	60% – 65% (science building 55% – 60%)	1
	Less than 60% (science building less than 55%)	0
Adequacy of space (5 points possible)	**Addresses adequacy of space issues.**	**Additive**
	Space upgrades needed to meet modern pedagogical standards.	Up to 3
	Improves program space configuration.	Up to 2
Program-related space allocation (weighted average, 6 points possible)	**Assignable square feet Percentage of total x points = score**	**Points**
	Instructional space (classroom, lab, library)	6
	Student advising/counseling services	4
	Child care	4
	Faculty offices	4
	Administrative	2
	Maintenance/central stores/student center	2
		= Total score

REPLACEMENT CATEGORY CRITERIA

Projects that replace failing permanent buildings to restore building life and upgrade space for program requirements.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Age of building since last major remodel (6 points possible)	**Provide documentation to verify age of building or portion proposed for replacement. For replacement projects with areas of differing ages, calculate a weighted average age based on square feet.**	**Select one**
	More than 40 years	6
	31 – 40 years	4
	20 – 30 years	2
	Less than 20 years	0
Condition of building or portion proposed for replacement (10 points possible)	**Building condition per 2014 comparable framework.**	**Select one**
	Superior (condition score 1)	0
	Adequate (condition score 2)	2
	Fair (condition score 3)	4
	Needs Improvement—Limited Functionality (condition score 4)	8
	Needs Improvement—Marginal Functionality (condition score 5)	10
Significant health, safety and code issues (10 points possible)	**Project improves one or more of the following areas by bringing it within current standards or applicable codes (provide supporting documentation).**	**Additive**
	Life safety (cite applicable code and issue)	Up to 4
	Seismic	Up to 2
	ADA access	Up to 2
	Energy code	Up to 2
Reasonableness of cost (12 points possible)	**Consistency with OFM cost standards.**	**Select one**
	Total project cost is less than or equal to expected cost per square foot for facility type, escalated to the construction mid-point.	9 - 12
	Project cost is between 100% and 111% of expected cost.	7 – 8
	Project cost is between 111% and 133% of expected cost.	1 – 6
	Project cost is more than 133% of expected cost.	0
Availability of space (10 points possible)	**Addresses insufficient space on campus to accommodate projected enrollment growth.**	**Select one**

	Replaces classroom space on a campus that currently exceeds the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and replaces class laboratory space to a campus that exceeds the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard.	1 – 2
	Replaces classroom space on a campus that does not exceed the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of classroom space.	Up to 5
	Replaces class laboratory space on a campus that does not exceed the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of class laboratories.	Up to 5
	Replaces space on a campus that does not meet HECB utilization standards and has no plan to achieve them and/or project has no impact on classroom or class laboratory utilization standards.	0
Efficiency of space allocation (5 points possible)	**Proposed space allocations are consistent with FEPG benchmarks or sufficient explanation is provided.**	**Select one**
	Project demonstrates consistency with space standards in FEPG benchmark.	3
	Project is not consistent with FEPG benchmarks, but makes a compelling case and provides documentation why benchmarks are not applicable.	Up to 3
	Project is not consistent with FEPG or other benchmarks.	0
	Proposed space allocations are consistent with building efficiency guidelines (ASF/GSF).	**Select one**
	More than 65% (science building more than 60%)	2
	60% – 65% (science building 55% - 60%)	1
	Less than 60% (science building less than 55%)	0
Adequacy of space (5 points possible)	**Addresses adequacy of space issues.**	**Additive**
	Space upgrades needed to meet modern pedagogical standards.	Up to 3
	Improves program space configuration.	Up to 2
Program-related space allocation (weighted average, 6 points possible)	**Assignable square feet Percentage of total x points = score**	**Points**
	Instructional space (classroom, lab, library)	6
	Student advising/counseling services	4
	Child care	4
	Faculty offices	4
	Administrative	2
	Maintenance/central stores/student center	2
		= Total Score

RESEARCH CATEGORY CRITERIA

Projects that promote economic growth and innovation through expanded research activity; equipment may be included.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Impact on economic development (15 points possible)		**Additive**
	Demonstrates that project is a critical component of an articulated state, regional or local comprehensive economic development plan.	Up to 5
	Provides documentation of federal or private funding available for research supported by project.	Up to 5
	Demonstrates economic impact benefits of project to the region through an economic impact study.	Up to 5
Impact on innovation (10 points possible)	**Demonstrates research activities proposed for the project will.**	**Select one:**
	Advance areas of existing preeminence.	Up to 10
	Position the institution for preeminence in a field or area of research.	Up to 7
Availability of research space (5 points possible)	**Project addresses insufficient space on campus to accommodate research needs.**	**Proportional**
	Adds research space to a campus in need of additional research facilities.	Up to 5
Adequacy of research space (5 points possible)	**Addresses suitability of existing space for research needs.**	**Additive**
	Space upgrades needed to meet current research standards or needs.	Up to 5
	Space upgrades needed to meet future research standards or needs.	Up to 2
Availability of instructional space (10 points possible)	**Addresses insufficient space on campus to accommodate projected enrollment growth.**	**Select one:**
	Adds/renovates classroom space on a campus that currently exceeds the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and adds/renovates class laboratory space to a campus that exceeds the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard.	1 - 2
	Adds/renovates classroom space on a campus that does not exceed the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of classroom space.	Up to 5
	Adds/renovates class laboratory space on a campus that does not exceed the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of class laboratories.	Up to 5
	Adds/renovates space on a campus that does not meet HECB utilization standards and has no plan to achieve them and/or project has no impact on classroom or class laboratory utilization standards.	0

Reasonableness of cost (12 points possible)	**Provides detailed baseline comparison to OFM cost standards.**	**Select one:**
	Total project cost is less than, or equal to, the expected cost per square foot for the type of facility escalated to the mid-construction date using provided construction cost index.	9 - 12
	Project cost is between 100% and 111% of expected cost.	7 - 8
	Project cost is between 111% and 137% of expected cost.	1 - 6
	Project cost is more than 137% of expected cost.	0
Contribution of other funding sources (10 points possible)	**Percent of project funded by sources other than state appropriations or building fund (projects with 50% or more of their funding coming from outside sources get maximum points).**	**Proportional**
	(Percent of project funded by non-state sources) x 20 = total points.	Up to 10
Integral to achieving statewide policy goals (4 points possible)	**Increases economic development through theoretical or applied research.**	**Up to 4**
	Is the proposed project necessary to conduct the proposed research?	Up to 1
	Is there clear and compelling evidence that the proposed research is likely to create or retain high-paying jobs?	Up to 1
	Is there clear and compelling evidence that the proposed research is likely to contribute to the solution of significant regional, national, or global challenges?	Up to 1
	Is there clear and compelling evidence that the proposed research is likely to increase the stability or competitiveness of the local or regional economy through the creation or retention of high-growth, high-paying companies?	Up to 1

PREDESIGN REQUEST CRITERIA

PREDESIGN EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Integral to achieving statewide policy goals (16 points possible)	**Promotes achievement of statewide goals established in former HECB strategic master plan or enacted legislation.**	**Additive, up to 12 points maximum**
	Increases number of bachelor's degrees awarded beyond 2015 level specified in institution's former HECB/OFM performance measures. Institutions to provide (a) number of bachelor's degrees awarded at the close of 2012-13 academic year, and (b) number of bachelor's degrees targeted for 2015.	**Up to 4**
	If a/b >= 100%	0
	If 75% <= a/b < 100%	1
	If 50% <= a/b < 75%	2
	If 25% <= a/b < 50%	3
	If a/b < 25%	4
	Increases number of bachelor's degrees awarded in high-demand fields beyond 2015 level specified in institution's former HECB/OFM performance measures. Institutions to provide (a) number of bachelor's degrees awarded in high-demand fields at the close of 2012-13 academic year, and (b) number of bachelor's degrees in high-demand fields targeted for 2015.	**Up to 4**
	If a/b >= 100%	0
	If 75% <= a/b < 100%	1
	If 50% <= a/b < 75%	2
	If 25% <= a/b < 50%	3
	If a/b < 25%	4
	Increases number of advanced degrees awarded beyond 2015 level specified in institution's former HECB/OFM performance measures. Institutions to provide (a) number of advanced degrees awarded at the close of 2012-13 academic year, and (b) number of advanced degrees targeted for 2015.	**Up to 4**
	If a/b >= 100%	0
	If 75% <= a/b < 100%	1
	If 50% <= a/b < 75%	2
	If 25% <= a/b < 50%	3

	If a/b < 25%	4
	Promotes access for underserved regions and place-bound adults through distance learning and/or university centers.	**Up to 4**
	Is distance learning or a university center a large and significant component of the total project scope?	Up to 2
	Is the project likely to enroll a significant number of students who are place-bound or residents of underserved regions?	Up to 2
Integral to institutional planning and goals (12 points possible)	**Achieves institutional planning goals and objectives.**	**Additive**
	Integral to Campus/Facilities Master Plan. Project must be initiated soon to sustain institutional program(s) and meet current demand for those program(s).	**Up to 8**
	Has the project been identified in the most recent Campus/Facilities Master Plan?	Up to 5
	Does the project following the sequencing laid out in the Master Plan? If not, explain why it is being requested now.	Up to 3
	Integral to institution's academic programs plan. Project must be initiated soon to implement successive measures of the Academic Plan to meet projected program requirements, growth of existing programs or demand for new programs.	**Up to 4**
	Must the project be initiated soon in order to meet academic certification requirements?	Up to 2
	To permit enrollment growth and/or specific quality improvements in current programs?	Up to 1
	To permit initiation of new programs?	Up to 1
Availability of appropriate space (10 points possible)	**Addresses suitability of existing space for specific programmatic needs.**	**Additive**
	Space upgrades to meet existing program standards or needs.	4 – 10
	Space upgrades to meet proposed program standards or needs.	1 – 3
Space utilization (10 points possible)	**Project is associated with a campus meeting or exceeding existing HECB utilization standards.**	**Select one**
	Adds or renovates classroom space on a campus that currently exceeds the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and renovates class laboratory space to a campus that exceeds the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard.	1 – 2
	Adds, renovates, or replaces classroom space on a campus that does not exceed the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of classroom space.	Up to 5

	Adds, renovates, or replaces class laboratory space on a campus that does not exceed the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard and project improves the utilization of class laboratories.	Up to 5
	Adds, renovates, or replaces space on a campus that does not meet HECB utilization standards and has no plan to achieve them and/or project has no impact on classroom or class laboratory utilization standards.	0
Condition of building (10 points possible)	**Building condition per 2014 comparable framework.**	**Select one**
	Not Applicable or Superior (condition score 1)	0
	Adequate (condition score 2)	6
	Fair (condition score 3)	10
	Needs Improvement – Limited Functionality (condition score 4)	8
	Needs Improvement – Marginal Functionality (condition score 5)	4

INFRASTRUCTURE CRITERIA

Major stand-alone infrastructure projects.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Significant life safety and code issues (14 points possible)	**Project improves one or more of the following areas by bringing it within current standards or applicable codes (provide supporting documentation).**	**Additive Up to 14 points maximum**
	Life safety (cite applicable code and issue)	Up to 4
	Seismic	Up to 2
	ADA access	Up to 2
	Energy code	Up to 2
	Utilities issues	Up to 2
	Transportation issues	Up to 2
Evidence of failure/ability to defer (6 points possible)	**Provide documentation showing.**	**Select one**
	Multiple repairs and/or service interruptions over past 5 years.	5 - 6
	Multiple repairs and/or service interruptions over past 2 years.	3 - 4
	Increasing utility or maintenance costs; system unreliable.	1 - 2
Impact on institution's operations without infrastructure project (6 points possible)	**Provide documentation showing that without the infrastructure project there will be.**	**Select one:**
	Serious impact on existing operations or programs.	6
	Serious impact on funded future construction projects.	5
	Serious impact on planned construction projects or future program needs.	3
Reasonable estimate (6 points possible)	**Reliability of cost estimate.**	**Select one:**
	A detailed cost estimate by applicable specialty professionals.	5 – 6
	A recent, detailed cost estimate by an experienced project manager.	2 – 4
	A brief cost estimate lacking specific detail.	0 – 1
Engineering study (6 points possible)	**Level of study.**	**Select one:**
	Comprehensive engineering study	6
	Site survey and recommendations	4
	Opinion letter	2
Supports facilities plan (6 points possible)	**Level of support.**	**Additive up to 6 points maximum**
	Integral to Facilities or Campus Master Plan.	Up to 3
	Integral to ongoing academic and research program needs.	Up to 3

Resource efficiency and sustainability (9 points possible)	Project provides documented benefits in the following areas.	Additive up to 9 points maximum
	Incorporates low-impact stormwater management techniques.	0 - 3
	Improvements in energy and resource conservation.	0 - 3
	Incorporates use of alternative energy sources.	0 - 3

ACQUISITION CRITERIA

SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Support by planning (15 points possible)	**Level of support.**	**Additive**
	Integral to Facilities or Campus Master Plan.	Up to 10
	Integral to Strategic Plan.	Up to 5
Reasonableness of cost (15 points possible)	**Provides baseline comparison of costs per acre of 2 comparable properties in same region as proposed land acquisition.**	**Additive**
	Cost per acre is less than or equal to 80% of average cost/acre of 2 comparables.	13 – 15
	Cost per acre is 81% – 100% of average cost/acres of 2 comparables.	10 – 12
	Cost per acre is 101% – 120% of average cost/acres of 2 comparables.	7 – 9
	Cost per acre is 121 % – 140% of average cost/acres of 2 comparables.	4 – 6
	Cost per acre is greater than 140% of average cost/acres of 2 comparables.	1 – 3
	No comparables provided.	0
Intended use (6 points possible)		**Select one:**
	Instructional building site.	6
	Non-instructional building site.	3
	Non-building site or no specific use determined at this time.	1
	No specific use determined at this time.	0
Land acquisition with non-usable buildings percentage of buildable area (8 points possible)	**Indicate the percentage of total property suitable for development based on the results of an environmental review and engineering inspection of property.**	**Select one**
	At least 75% of site is buildable.	6 - 8
	50% – 74% of site is buildable.	3 - 5
	Less than 50% of site is buildable.	1 - 2
	No information provided.	0
	OR	
Facility acquisition or land acquisition with usable facilities (8 points possible)	**Indicate the condition of the facility, using the methodology prescribed in the 2014 comparable framework study as evaluated by an architect or engineer.**	**Select one:**
	Superior (condition score 1)	4

	Adequate (condition score 2)	3
	Fair (condition score 3)	2
	Needs Improvement – Limited Functionality (condition score 4)	1
	Needs Improvement – Marginal Functionality (condition score 5)	0
	AND	
	Capital Improvements required to adapt facility to proposed use.	**Select one:**
	Facility requires no funding to adapt facility to proposed use.	4
	Facility requires less than 10% of appraised value to adapt facility to proposed use.	3
	Facility requires between 10% and 30% of appraised value to adapt facility to proposed use.	1 - 2
	Facility requires 30% or more than appraised value to adapt facility to proposed use.	0
Savings to operating costs (8 points possible)	**Submit calculations demonstrating any cost savings to operating costs due to the acquisition.**	**Select one**
	Estimated savings to operating costs will pay back the total cost of the acquisition in 10 years or less.	5 - 8
	Estimated savings to operating costs will pay back the total cost of the acquisition in 10-20 years.	2 - 4
	Estimated savings to operating costs will pay back the total cost of acquisition in more than 20 years.	0