OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

STATE OF WASHINGTON

2011-13 CAPITAL PROJECTS EVALUATION SYSTEM:

FOUR-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
PROJECT EVALUATION GUIDELINES AND APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

BUDGET DIVISION
MAY 2010

To accommodate persons with disabilities, this document is available in alternative formats and can be obtained by contacting
The Office of Financial Management at 360-902-0555 or TTY 360-902-0679

VISIT OUR WEB SITE AT www.ofm.wa.gov

Table of Contents

OVERVIEW OF CONTENTS

Section 1.0 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 2011-13, as suggested by 2009-11 participants, legislative staff and the Legislature. Key dates are also provided.

Section 2.0 describes the evaluation framework and defines project categories.

Section 3.0 outlines the evaluation process, including evaluation panel structure and process phases.

Section 4.0 includes submittal guidelines, instructions for project proposals and checklist for required elements.

Section 5.0 provides the expected project cost ranges by type of facility and construction cost index for escalating costs to mid-construction date.

Section 6.0 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

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND AND DIRECTION

Legislative Intent. In 2008, the Legislature enacted RCW 43.88D, which established a new process for evaluating and scoring capital project requests by the state's four-year higher education institutions. The legislation emphasized the role 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, objective and implementable system that provides the 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.

The legislation repealed RCW 28B.76.220, which had required development of a single prioritized list of capital project requests across all four-year institutions. In its place, the Office of Financial Management (OFM), in consultation with the legislative fiscal committees and the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC), was directed to design and implement a new process similar to the one used by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC). In the SBCTC system, projects are scored and prioritized within a single, clearly defined category, with evaluation criteria identified for project scoring within each category. The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) and SBCTC were directed to provide technical support in developing the new scoring system.

For the 2009-11 cycle, the six institutions prepared and submitted 54 separate project proposals, for a total of $1.6 billion of state capital appropriations over the ensuing six years. The proposals were reviewed and scored by 38 evaluators and facilitators, who were organized into 12 review panels. Of the 54 projects proposed, the Governor recommended in her 2009-11 capital budget proposal to the Legislature that 27 be funded, at a six-year cost of $1.1 billion. The Governor's budget proposal adhered to the rank order assigned through the panel scoring, with two exceptions. The Legislature, in 2009 and 2010, ultimately provided for 17 of the 54 projects originally proposed, "skipping" 12 projects to fund others that had scored lower. Of the 12 projects passed over, five were in the infrastructure category, five were for predesign funding, one was for a construction project which the institution requested be skipped in favor of a project that had ranked lower, and one was for design funding.

State Strategic and Financial Context. During its 2010 session, the Legislature reaffirmed the evaluation and scoring system established in 2008, while again returning to the concept of a single prioritized list. Under Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6355, the HECB is to provide the Governor and Legislature with a single prioritized list, by November 15, 2010, of the major projects that the board recommends be funded with state bond and building account appropriations during the 2011-13 biennium. In developing the list, the HECB is to be guided by the OFM project evaluation and scoring process, and identify the combination of projects that will most cost-effectively achieve the state's goals.

Those goals are increasing degree production, particularly in high-demand fields; promoting economic development through research and innovation; providing high-quality, affordable educational environments; preserving assets; and efficiently using instructional space. The HECB is to assume that state bond and building account appropriations remain at the same level during 2011-13 and 2013-15 as was appropriated in 2009-11; that major projects funded for design are funded for construction before state appropriations are provided for new projects; and that minor works, health, safety, code and preservation projects are funded at the same average level as in recent biennia before state appropriations are provided for new major projects.

The capital project evaluation and scoring system is being undertaken within the context of the state's overall goals for higher education, as articulated in the HECB Strategic Master Plan adopted by the Legislature in 2008. The Strategic Master Plan, as further elaborated in ESSB 6355, establishes high-level goals to ensure access to affordable postsecondary education; increase undergraduate and graduate degree production, particularly in high-demand fields; make advances in academic research that will improve the competitive position of Washington's businesses; and promote innovation and economic growth statewide. To be effective, these goals need to be linked to specific priorities and strategic investment plans that will ensure appropriate and congruent outcomes. As stated in RCW 43.88D, "the legislature further finds the goal of creating additional, innovative facilities and programs that meet the learning needs of students throughout the state in a timely and cost-effective fashion requires a new approach to facility prioritization that emphasizes strategic planning." At the same time, the state continues to face significant constraints on its ability to fund higher education capital facilities.

Given these challenges, the capital projects evaluation and scoring system is intended to align the state's higher education goals with capital facility spending choices. Other objectives of the system are to:

- Provide decision-makers with comprehensive and accurate analysis of the relative value of potential capital projects;
- Provide comparable information across multiple institutions and projects;
- Develop and conduct a transparent, fair and understandable project evaluation process;
- More closely align the higher education capital project selection process with the community and technical college system model.

WHAT'S NEW FOR 2011-13

In addition to the production of a single list, other significant changes include the following:

1. Projects that have received state appropriations for design are considered to be "first in the pipeline," and do not need to submit proposals. Institutions are required to submit all other required capital budget system documents for such projects, and should clearly identify in those documents any changes in scope or cost from documents previously provided OFM and the Legislature.
2. Projects for which predesign funding is requested will be evaluated and scored within a new separate category. They will not "compete" with projects that have completed predesigns and are seeking design funding. The criteria and scoring within this category have been adjusted to reflect project information available prior to conducting a predesign study. Although institutions will be asked to designate the category that best suits the project proposal (Growth, Renovation, Replacement, Research), the predesign requests will be scored as a whole, not by category. If an institution self-funded predesign, the institution may submit that project to be scored for design funding, provided that a completed predesign document is on file with OFM by July 1, 2010.
3. A new category for land acquisition has been established. This is intended for land acquisitions not specifically associated with a project for which predesign, design or construction funding is being proposed.
4. Predesign requests, infrastructure projects and land acquisitions are eligible for allocation of institutional priority points. Institutional priority points equal approximately 10 percent of a given category and are allocated among the institution's top three projects in these categories. Institutions may also apply priority points to design requests, allocated to the institution's top three projects in the Growth, Renovation, Replacement and Research categories.
5. Except for the new land acquisition category, institutions no longer identify and describe comparable projects for purposes of evaluating the reasonableness of proposed costs. Instead, reasonableness is to be assessed relative to the OFM cost guidelines in Section 5.0.
6. E2SSB 5560 added policy related to greenhouse gas emissions to state funding for infrastructure and economic development programs. This policy is defined in RCW 70.235.070 and must be implemented in calendar year 2010.

   Consequently, institutions are required to submit documentation indicating they have adopted policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with RCW 70.235.070, and to reduce annual per capita vehicle miles in accordance with RCW 47.01.440 or RCW 43.160.020 for rural counties. (Generally, rural counties include all counties except Clark, King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, Spokane and Thurston counties. Please see http://www.ofm.wa.gov/pop/popden/rural.asp for a current listing.)

   Institutions submitting a design request will also need to address those components/ systems identified through the predesign process that support their greenhouse gas reduction policy and vehicle miles reduction policy. Please see the memorandum from OFM Director Victor Moore that addresses the implementation of this bill. http://www.ofm.wa.gov/budget/documents/implement_rcw70_235_070.pdf

KEY DATES FOR THE 2011-13 CAPITAL PROJECT EVALUATION PROCESS	
Institutions nominate panel members to assist in scoring	April 19-30
OFM recruits panel members from agencies, creates evaluation panels	April 19-May 14
Evaluation guidelines and application instructions released	May 3
Q&A period	May 3-July 23
Q&A responses, additional information posted to website (In general, responses will be posted within two working days)	May 3-July 23
Institutions submit completed predesign documents to OFM	July 1
Evaluation Panels Meeting #1: Orientation and Charge	July 19-23
Institutions submit project proposals	**Aug. 1**
OFM reviews project proposals for consistency and completeness	Aug. 2-6
Institutions submit revised proposals correcting identified gaps, inconsistencies (as needed)	Aug. 9-13
Panel members independently review project proposals	Aug. 16-27
Evaluation Panels Meeting #2: Discuss application of criteria to proposals, develop follow-up questions for institutions as needed.	Aug. 30-Sept. 3
Site visits as needed	Aug. 20-Sept. 10
Institutions respond to follow-up questions from Meeting #2	Sept. 6-10
Institutions submit capital budget request to OFM	**Sept. 7**
Evaluation Panels Meeting #3: Evaluation panels complete project scoring	Sept. 13-17
Evaluation Panel Meeting #4: OFM compiles scoring results, presents to four-year institutions	Sept. 20-24
Release results to HECB, legislative fiscal committees, four-year institutions	Oct. 1
HECB budget recommendation submitted to OFM and Legislature	Nov. 15
Debrief with institutions	Nov. 22-Dec. 3
Governor's budget proposal transmitted to Legislature	No later than Dec. 20
Process debrief and review	June 2011 (after legislative session)

Contact: Jeanne Rynne, Capital Budget Assistant to the Governor, Office of Financial Management, (360) 902-3068, Fax (360) 664-8941, jeanne.rynne@ofm.wa.gov.

Chapter 2

PROJECT EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND CATEGORIES

SCORING FRAMEWORK

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

Once projects are selected internally, institutions should prepare and submit a **project proposal** for any project expected to have a cumulative total cost of more than $2 million over the three biennia beginning in 2011-13. There is one exception: 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. Institutions should consult with the OFM higher education capital budget analyst about whether a change is significant enough to require that a proposal be submitted.

Based upon the project's primary purpose, the institution must identify the particular category (Predesign, Growth, Renovation, Replacement, Research, Infrastructure or Land) 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. Consult with OFM for questions about classification.

The project proposal must specifically address the evaluation criteria. This includes 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, 2010, for any project for which the institution is seeking design funding during 2011-13.

Minor works are not subject to this process, and will not be scored or evaluated. Refer to the 2011-21 Capital Budget Instructions issued by OFM for further guidance.

Evaluation. Each project will be evaluated and scored within one of the seven categories. 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). The system has not been designed to compare projects across categories, and attempts to do so would be flawed.

Once all of the capital project requests have been scored, OFM will assemble them into a ranked list, by category. The HECB will then use the ranked category lists to prepare a single prioritized list. The Governor and the Legislature will use the rankings generated by the Higher Education Project Evaluation process and the prioritized list developed by the HECB to inform and guide development of their capital budget proposals for 2011-13 and subsequent biennia.

The evaluation and scoring process is two-level:

- Overarching criteria: applicable to all project categories except Infrastructure and Land.
- Category-specific criteria: applicable within each of the seven categories.

CAPITAL PROJECT CATEGORIES AND DEFINITIONS

Exhibits A and B present a summary of the capital project evaluation categories and scoring criteria. Each capital project request should be made exclusively within one category, 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. Consult with OFM for questions about project classification.

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

- Predesign requests
- Growth
- Renovation
- Replacement
- Research
- Infrastructure
- Land acquisition

RCW 43.88D had combined Renovation/Replacement projects in one category; subsequently, ESSB 6355 separates them into two categories. This provides for more nuanced scoring criteria and mirrors the SBCTC process as well as those in place in other states. The project categories are based on the following definitions:

Predesign Request: Identification of best future capital solution

This encompasses 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 $5 million or more to implement.

Growth: Access-related projects to accommodate enrollment growth

This encompasses 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. 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 for program requirements

This encompasses projects that renovate facilities to restore building life and upgrade space to meet current program requirements. 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: Projects that replace failing permanent buildings to restore building life and upgrade space for program requirements

This pertains to facilities that cannot be economically renovated. 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 that promote economic growth and innovation through expanded research activity

This pertains to projects whose primary purpose is to promote research, 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: Major stand-alone infrastructure projects

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.

Land acquisition (stand-alone): Future development or general benefit

This category is intended for the acquisition or cleanup of land for which no specific facility project is being proposed. Land acquisition needed for a specific facility should be included in the category most closely associated with the facility.

EXHIBIT A: PREDESIGN, INFRASTRUCTURE AND LAND REQUESTS

INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITY POINTS – APPLY ONCE ACROSS PREDESIGN, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND LAND CATEGORIES

1st Priority = 6 points, 2nd Priority = 4 points, 3rd priority = 2 points

OVERARCHING CRITERIA

PREDESIGN REQUESTS

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Points
Increases bachelor degrees	4
Increases bachelor degrees in high- demand fields	4
Increases advanced degrees	4
Increases economic development through research	4
Promotes access	4
Integral to Master Plan	6
Integral to Strategic Plan	4
GHG	2
Institutional priority	**6**
Availability of appropriate space	8
Current space utilization	8
Condition of building	8
Category Total	**62**

INFRASTRUCTURE

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Points
Institutional priority	**6**
Reasonableness of cost	6
Evidence of failure/ability to defer	6
Impact on university preparations without infrastructure project	6
Significant health, safety, code issues	12
Engineering Study	6
Supports facilities plan	6
Resource efficiency & sustainability	8
Greenhouse gas emissions	2
Category Total	**58**

LAND

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Points
Institutional priority	**6**
Reasonableness of cost	15
Intended use	5
Buildable %	5
Supported by planning	20
Greenhouse gas emissions	2
Category Total	**53**

Note: Institutional priority points have been adjusted to equate to 10 percent of each category's total maximum points.

EXHIBIT B: DESIGN REQUESTS

GROWTH **RENOVATION** **REPLACEMENT** **RESEARCH**

Overarching Evaluation Criteria

Integral to Achieving Statewide Policy Goals
(20 points possible)

Integral to University's Planning and Goals
(10 points possible)

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction
(2 points possible)

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)

Total Points = 42

Evaluation Criteria	Max Points
Reasonableness of cost	12
Availability of space	5
Efficiency of space allocation	5
Program-related space allocation	6
Enrollment growth	20
Category Subtotal	**48**
Including Overarching	**90**

Evaluation criteria	Max Points
Reasonableness of cost	12
Availability of space	5
Efficiency of space Allocation	5
Program-related space Allocation	6
Significant health, safety, code Issues	10
Adequacy of space	5
Condition of building	10
Age of building since last major remodel	6
Category Subtotal	**59**
Including Overarching	**101**

Evaluation Criteria	Max Points
Reasonableness of cost	12
Availability of space	5
Efficiency of space Allocation	5
Program-related space Allocation	6
Significant health, safety, code issues	10
Adequacy of space	5
Condition of building	10
Age of building since last major remodel	6
Category Subtotal	**59**
Including Overarching	**101**

Evaluation Criteria	Max Points
Reasonableness of cost	12
Availability of instructional space	5
Availability of research space	5
Adequacy of research space	5
Impact on economic development	15
Impact on innovation	10
Contribution of other funding sources	10
Category Subtotal	**62**
Including Overarching	**104**

Chapter 3

PROJECT EVALUATION AND SCORING PROCESS

EVALUATION PANEL STRUCTURE

Exhibit C is a schematic of the project evaluation and scoring process that will be used for 2011-13. The process involves formation of **Capital Project Evaluation Panels** with representation from the following groups:

- Office of Financial Management – operating and capital sections
- Higher Education Coordinating Board
- Department of Commerce
- Department of General Administration
- Staff from four-year institutions:
  - Capital Facilities
  - Academic Affairs
- Consultants who are capital facilities experts

Organizational Structure. The panel will be organized into four or five smaller groups, each responsible for evaluating and scoring a project subset. Panels will operate under these guidelines:

- Small groups will evaluate and score projects in one or more categories, depending upon proposal volume.
- Representatives from institutions will not score their own projects.
- Members of each group will review project proposals individually, then meet in their small groups to discuss and come to an agreement on scoring.
- Small group facilitators will be OFM and legislative capital budget staff who will participate in scoring discussions as non-voting members.

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 process.
- Provide comparable information across multiple institutions and projects.
- Respond to legislative direction that defines a new role for OFM in evaluating and scoring requests.
- More closely align the higher education capital project selection process with the community and technical college system model.

EXHIBIT C: EVALUATION PROCESS

CAPITAL PROJECTS EVALUATION PANEL		
COMPOSITION	**STRUCTURE**	**MEETINGS**
OFM HECB Dept of Commerce GA Four-year institutions: Capital facilities Academic affairs Independent facilities consultants	✓ Panel members score and evaluate the projects; initial review and scoring is done in small groups of 4-5. ✓ Groups evaluate and score projects in one or more categories, depending upon proposal volume. ✓ Representatives from four-year institutions will not score their own projects. ✓ Institutions will identify 1-2 individuals with capital facilities expertise and 1-2 individuals from academic affairs. Final composition will be determined by OFM in consultation with legislative staff. ✓ OFM and legislative capital budget staff will facilitate the scoring process and participate in scoring discussions as non-voting members.	Meeting #1: Orientation and Charge Meeting #2: Initial Project Proposal Review Meeting #3: Evaluation Panels Complete Project Scoring Meeting #4: Present Scoring Results and Debrief

EVALUATION PROCESS PHASES

As displayed in Exhibit C, the panels will work through a multi-part process:

1. Orientation
2. Information Gathering and Project Proposal Review
3. Evaluation and Scoring
4. Review Scoring Results and Debrief

Question and Answer Period. Between May 3 and July 23, institutions may submit written questions to OFM, which will post responses on its website, generally within two working days.

Phase 1: Orientation

One meeting will be scheduled whose purpose is to acquaint panel members with the process and guidelines for evaluating projects, and to ensure that members understand the desired outcomes.

Panel Meeting #1: Panel Charge

- Overview and Q&A about the process, project categories and evaluation criteria
- "Example scoring" and development of a common understanding of definitions, criteria and scoring protocols

Phase 2: Information Gathering and Initial Project Report Review

Project proposals should be clear and require no additional explanation. However, given that this process continues to evolve from biennium to biennium, the purpose of Phase 2 is to surface any questions from panel members and allow institutions to clarify their submittals. OFM will distribute submittals to the small group panels. Panel members will independently review the project proposals, and note questions about the proposals and how to apply the criteria.
At their second meeting, panel members will discuss their questions and finalize a question list to be provided to OFM. Institutions will then have the opportunity to respond to panel questions in writing. OFM may arrange visits to project sites if deemed essential to the evaluation process.

Panel Meeting #2: Initial Project Proposal Review

- Discuss application of criteria to project proposals generally
- Finalize list of questions about proposals to submit to institutions

Phase 3: Evaluation and Scoring

To determine a score for each project within each category, panel members will meet to assign scores to every project under their review. 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 into draft lists.

Panel Meeting #3: Review and Scoring

- Score assigned project proposals
- Identify notes, comments and feedback to convey to the institutions

Combined Small Group Meetings: Resolve Tie Scores. If necessary, two (or more) small groups meet to resolve tie scores

Product: Scoring results are returned by panel members to OFM for compilation.

Phase 4: Phase 2 Scoring

Project scores, prioritized within each category, will be released to legislative fiscal committees, the HECB and the institutions by October 1, 2010. The HECB will review results and prepare a single prioritized list. Its recommendation will be based on the funding level and composition of higher education's relative share of the capital budget in the current biennium. The HECB will provide its recommendation to the Legislature and OFM by November 15, 2010.

OFM will conduct meetings with each institution to explain the scoring and debrief about the process. Institutions will also receive notes and comments about the project proposals.

Product: HECB budget recommendation is submitted to the Legislature and OFM; meeting summaries are prepared for each debriefing meeting, reflecting input.

Panel Meeting #4: Debrief and Review Total Scoring. Review final list for each category

Products: A project list and accompanying project scores for each category; notes and comments for each institution.

Phase 5: Process Debrief and Review (post legislative session)

The purpose here is to improve the process for the next biennium. Once the legislative session is adjourned 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.

Beginning with the 2011-13 biennium, only projects that are seeking predesign or design funding will be scored. Projects funded for design in a prior biennium are already in the "pipeline" and are expected to be funded for construction unless there are significant changes to scope or cost.

Therefore, the big questions for OFM, the HECB and the Legislature are: "Which new projects should be funded for predesign, for possible design and for construction funding two to four years from now?" and "Which projects should be funded for design next biennium and construction the biennium after?"

Chapter 4

PROJECT PROPOSAL AND SUBMITTAL GUIDELINES

PROJECT PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL AND DUE DATE

- Proposals are limited to **10 pages** (excluding capital budget system forms, diagrams and sketches, appendices, cover sheet, title page, and table of contents)
- Each project proposal must be submitted within a single project category; do not submit Minor Works projects for this scoring process.
- Institutions should **submit 10 copies to OFM**, along with an electronic copy of the request.
- Proposals are due to OFM by 5 p.m., August 1, 2010.
- Submit electronic copies to Jeanne Rynne, jeanne.rynne@ofm.wa.gov.

PROPOSAL FORMAT

Project proposals should be organized in four parts:

1. Brief summary description of the project
2. Overarching evaluation criteria: how the project addresses statewide and institutional planning criteria
3. Category-specific information: how the project addresses each evaluation criterion within the category
4. Appendices: supplemental and supporting documentation, including technical exhibits

CONTENT INSTRUCTIONS

Each project proposal should address the following elements:

1. Summary Narrative: Project Scope and Description

Succinctly describe the proposed project, and include the following information:

- ☐ Category of project request
- ☐ Expected schedule or timeframe
- ☐ Estimated funding by source and biennium
- ☐ Problem statement, short description — needs, benefits and consequences of not doing the project
- ☐ History of the project or facility
- ☐ Programs addressed or encompassed by the project

2. **Overarching 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(s) the project is expected to address, and describe how and the 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.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction. Provide documentation indicating the institution has adopted policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with RCW 70.235.070, and to reduce annual per capita vehicle miles in accordance with RCW 47.01.440 or RCW 43.160.020 for rural counties. (Generally, rural counties include all counties except Clark, King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, Spokane and Thurston counties. Please see http://www.ofm.wa.gov/pop/popden/rural.asp for a current listing.)
Institutions submitting a design request will need to address those components/systems identified through the predesign process that support their policies for greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles reduction.

Institutional Priority Points. Predesign requests, infrastructure projects and land acquisitions are eligible for allocation of priority points among the institution's top three projects. Institutional priority points equal approximately 10 percent of a given category. A project can receive a maximum of 6 points in this category: 6 for first priority, 4 for second priority and 2 for the third priority.

Institutions may also apply priority points to design requests; 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, 8 for second priority and 6 for third priority.

3. **Category-specific Information: Response to Evaluation Criteria**

A summary of the project categories and category-specific evaluation criteria is shown below. Proposers should clearly state how each project submitted meets the criteria within its category, attaching supporting data (and noting on which page it can be found) where appropriate. For detail on evaluation criteria and the associated scoring, please consult Section 6.

A. Predesign

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.

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

Space Utilization: Identify the average number of hours per week each (a) classroom seat and (b) classroom lab is expected to be utilized in fall 2010 on the proposed project's campus. If the campus does not meet the 22 hours per classroom seat and/or the 16 hours per class lab HECB utilization standards, describe any institutional plans for achieving that level of utilization.

Fall 2010 utilization should be estimated by taking fall 2009 actual enrollment and increasing it by the percentage by which academic year 2010-11 state-supported enrollment is budgeted to exceed academic year 2010 budgeted enrollment.

Condition of Building: Provide the facility's 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 supporting documentation in appendices, and reference them in the body of the proposal.

Cost Estimate: Provide the Capital Budget System cost estimate (CBS report 003) for the entire project regardless of fund source, plus as much detailed cost information that is available. This information is required but not scored for predesign requests.

B. Growth Category

Enrollment Growth: Identify the number of additional full-time equivalent (FTE) state-supported students expected to be served 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. The maximum of 15 points will be given to a project that adds capacity for 300 or more state-supported FTEs.

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

Availability of Space: Identify the average number of hours per week each (a) classroom seat and (b) classroom lab is expected to be utilized in fall 2010 on the proposed project's campus. If the campus does not meet the 22 hours per classroom seat and/or the 16 hours per class lab HECB utilization standards, describe any institutional plans for achieving that level of utilization.

Fall 2010 utilization should be estimated by taking fall 2009 actual enrollment and increasing it by the percentage by which academic year 2010-11 state-supported enrollment is budgeted to exceed academic year 2010 budgeted enrollment.

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.

To the extent any proposed allocations exceed FEPG standards, explain the alternative standard used, and why.
http://www.hecb.wa.gov/news/newsreports/documents/FacilitiesEvaluationandPlanningGuide.pdf

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

Reasonableness of Cost: Provide the Capital Budget System cost estimate (CBS report 003) for the entire project regardless of fund source, plus as much detailed cost information that is available.

Program-related Space Allocation: Identify planned use of proposed space, including assignable square footages by use type. Use the table below to provide the requested information:

Type of Space	Assignable Square Feet	Percentage of Total
Instructional space (classroom, lab, library)		
Student advising/counseling services		
Child care		
Faculty offices		
Administrative		
Maintenance/central stores/student center		
Total		**100%**

C. Renovation Category

Age of building since last major remodel: 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.

Availability of space: Identify the average number of hours per week each (a) classroom seat and (b) classroom lab is expected to be utilized in fall 2010 on the proposed project's campus. If the campus does not meet the 22 hours per classroom seat and/or the 16 hours per class lab HECB utilization standards, describe any institutional plans for achieving that level of utilization.

Fall 2010 utilization should be estimated by taking fall 2009 actual enrollment and increasing it by the percentage by which academic year 2010-11 state supported enrollment is budgeted to exceed academic year 2010 budgeted enrollment.

Condition of building: Provide the facility's 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 supporting documentation in appendices, and reference them in the body of the proposal.

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 toward 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 3, 4 or 5 will receive additional points in scoring.

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. Provide supporting documentation in appendices, and reference them in the body of the proposal.

Reasonableness of cost: Provide the Capital Budget System cost estimate (CBS report 003) for the entire project regardless of fund source, plus as much detailed cost information that is available.

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. To the extent any proposed allocations exceed FEPG standards, explain the alternative standard that has been used, and why.
http://www.hecb.wa.gov/news/newsreports/documents/FacilitiesEvaluationandPlanningGuide.pdf

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

Adequacy of space: Describe the extent to which the project is needed to meet modern pedagogical standards and/or to improve space configurations, and how it would accomplish that.

Program-related space allocation: Identify planned use or uses of proposed space, including assignable square footages by use type. The table in section 3B of this chapter can be used to provide the requested information.

D. Replacement Category

Age of building since last major remodel: Identify the number of years since the last substantial renovation of the facility or the area proposed for replacement. If the project involves replacement of multiple wings of the building or multiple buildings 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 or building.

Condition of building: Provide the facility's 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. Calculate a weighted average condition based on square feet where more than one aging building is to be replaced. Provide supporting documentation in appendices, and reference them in the body of the proposal.

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 Replacement, points are weighted toward buildings with marginal functionality.

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. Provide supporting documentation in appendices, and reference them in the body of the proposal.

Reasonableness of cost: Provide the Capital Budget System cost estimate (CBS report 003) for the entire project regardless of fund source, plus as much detailed cost information that is available based on the project phase. This information is required for both predesign and design requests, but is scored only for design requests.

Availability of space: Identify the average number of hours per week each (a) classroom seat and (b) classroom lab is expected to be utilized in fall 2010 on the proposed project's campus. If the campus does not meet the 22 hours per classroom seat and/or the 16 hours per class lab HECB utilization standards, describe institutional plans for achieving that level of utilization.

Fall 2010 utilization should be estimated by taking fall 2009 actual enrollment and increasing it by the percentage by which academic year 2010-11 state supported enrollment is budgeted to exceed academic year 2010 budgeted enrollment.

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. To the extent any proposed allocations exceed FEPG standards, explain the alternative standard that has been used, and why.
http://www.hecb.wa.gov/news/newsreports/documents/FacilitiesEvaluationandPlanningGuide.pdf

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

Adequacy of space: Describe whether and the extent to which the project is needed to meet modern pedagogical standards and/or to improve space configurations, and how it would accomplish that.

Program-related space allocation: Identify planned use or uses of proposed space, including assignable square footages by use type. The table in section 3B of this chapter can be used to provide the requested information.

E. Research Category

Impact on economic development: 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 supporting documentation in a clearly referenced appendix.

Impact on innovation: 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: Describe the extent to which there is sufficient space (square footage) in existing campus facilities to conduct the proposed research.

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

Availability of instructional space: If the proposed project includes classrooms or instructional lab space, identify the average number of hours per week each (a) classroom seat and (b) classroom lab is expected to be utilized in fall 2010 on the proposed project's campus. If the campus does not meet the 22 hours per classroom seat and/or the 16 hours per class lab HECB utilization standards, describe institutional plans for achieving that level of utilization.

Fall 2010 utilization should be estimated by taking fall 2009 actual enrollment and increasing it by the percentage by which academic year 2010-11 state supported enrollment is budgeted to exceed academic year 2010 budgeted enrollment.

Reasonableness of cost: Provide the Capital Budget System cost estimate (CBS report 003) for the entire project regardless of fund source, plus as much detailed cost information that is available based on the project phase. This information is required for both predesign and design requests, but is scored only for design requests.

Contribution of other funding sources: 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.

F. Infrastructure Category

Significant health, safety and code issues: Identify whether the project is needed to bring the facility within current seismic, life safety, ADA, energy, utilities or transportation code requirements. Clearly identify the applicable standard or code, and describe how the project will improve consistency with it. Provide supporting documentation in appendices, and reference them in the body of the proposal.

Evidence of failure/ability to defer project: Identify prior facility failures, increasing utility and/or maintenance costs, and/or system unreliability. Provide supporting documentation in appendices, and reference them in the body of the proposal.

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

Reasonable estimate: Provide the Capital Budget System cost estimate (CBS report 003) for the entire project regardless of fund source, plus as much detailed cost estimate information that is available based on the project phase.

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

Supports facilities plan: Describe the proposed project's relationship and relative importance to the Facilities or Campus Master Plan and the Strategic Plan.

Resource efficiency and sustainability: Document project benefits associated with low-impact development, improvements in energy and resource conservation, and use of alternative energy sources.

Note: "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.

Greenhouse gas emissions: Submit documentation indicating that the institution has adopted policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with RCW 70.235.070, and to reduce annual per capita vehicle miles in accordance with RCW 47.01.440 or RCW 43.160.020 for rural counties.

G. Land Category

Supports Facilities Plan: Describe the project's relationship and relative importance to the Facilities or Campus Master Plan and the Strategic Plan.

Reasonableness of cost: Provide an appraisal of the land to be acquired or an estimate of the state's liability for cleanup of the land already owned. In addition to the appraisal, provide costs for two comparable land acquisitions in the same area. Provide the Capital Budget System cost estimate (CBS report 003) 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: Indicate the percentage of the total property 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.

Greenhouse gas emissions: Submit documentation indicating that the institution has adopted policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with RCW 70.235.070, and to reduce annual per capita vehicle miles in accordance with RCW 47.01.440 or RCW 43.160.020 for rural counties. Identify how the proposed land acquisition is consistent with the institution's policy.

APPENDICES

Institutions are **required** to submit Capital Project Request CBS002 and Project Cost Estimate CBS003 reports.

Institutions are **encouraged** to submit supplemental and supporting project documentation, limited to materials directly related to the evaluation criteria, such as:

- Degree and enrollment growth projections
- Relevant excerpts from institutional plans
- Data on instructional and/or research space utilization
- Additional documentation for selected cost comparables (land category only)
- Relevant materials on facility conditions
- Relevant 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
- Relevant 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
- Relevant 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 dated December 10, 2008 prepared by Berk & Associates, http://www.ofm.wa.gov/budget/capital/higher_ed_capital_finance_study.pdf. This study was completed in response to ESHB 3329, enacted by the 2008 Legislature.

		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 2010

The following data is based on the Global Insight February 2010 forecast for state and local government spending. It is to be used for adjusting the expected costs from July 1, 2008, to the mid-construction date for comparison to project estimates. The May 2010 Global Insight forecast will be posted on the OFM website in early June.

Mid-construction Date	Construction Index	Mid-construction Date	Construction Index	Mid-construction Date	Construction Index	Mid-construction Date	Construction Index
7/1/08	1.000	11/15/11	1.047	2/14/15	1.163	8/16/18	1.232
8/15/08	1.009	2/14/12	1.054	5/16/15	1.169	11/15/18	1.237
11/14/08	1.034	5/15/12	1.063	8/16/15	1.175	2/14/19	1.242
2/14/09	1.047	7/16/12	1.069	11/15/15	1.180	5/16/19	1.246
5/16/09	1.035	8/15/12	1.072	2/14/16	1.185	8/16/19	1.251
8/16/09	1.022	11/14/12	1.082	5/15/16	1.189	11/15/19	1.255
11/15/09	1.020	2/14/13	1.092	8/15/16	1.194	2/14/20	1.260
2/14/10	1.019	5/16/13	1.103	11/14/16	1.199	5/15/20	1.264
5/16/10	1.022	8/16/13	1.113	2/14/17	1.204	8/15/20	1.268
8/16/10	1.025	11/15/13	1.123	5/16/17	1.208	11/14/20	1.272
11/15/10	1.028	2/14/14	1.132	8/16/17	1.213	2/14/21	1.591
2/14/11	1.030	5/16/14	1.141	11/15/17	1.218	5/16/21	1.597
5/16/11	1.034	8/16/14	1.149	2/14/18	1.223	8/16/21	1.602
8/16/11	1.040	11/15/14	1.156	5/16/18	1.227		

ADJUSTMENT OF EXPECTED COST RANGES

Here is an example of how to determine the expected cost range:

Facility Type: Classrooms

Construction Dates, Start: September 1, 2011 (from CBS003)
End: June 1, 2013 (from CBS003)
Mid-point: July 16, 2012 (calculated)

Construction Index for Mid-point: 1.069 (interpolated from index table)

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

Expected Total Project Cost at Construction Mid-point: $449 (calculated)

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.

All design requests: A completed predesign study, completed in accordance with the OFM predesign manual, has been submitted to OFM by July 1, 2010.

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

Infrastructure and land acquisition: Request is a single project funded in one biennium.

OVERARCHING EVALUATION CRITERIA (APPLIES TO PREDESIGN AND DESIGN REQUESTS)

These overarching evaluation criteria have been identified:

1. Integral to achieving statewide policy goals.
2. Integral to institutional planning and goals.
3. Greenhouse gas emissions reduction.

These criteria reflect the Legislature's intent to align capital project funding with statewide and institutional policy goals. They represent 32 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 and Land.

OVERARCHING EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Integral to achieving statewide policy goals (20 points possible)	**Promotes achievement of statewide goals established in HECB Strategic Master Plan or enacted legislation.**	**Additive, up to 20 points maximum**
	Increases number of bachelor's degrees awarded beyond 2011 level specified in institution's current HECB/OFM performance measures.	Up to 4
	Increases number of bachelor's degrees awarded in high-demand fields beyond 2011 level specified in institution's current HECB/OFM performance measures.	Up to 4
	Increases number of advanced degrees awarded beyond 2011 level specified in institution's current HECB/OFM performance measures.	Up to 4
	Increases economic development through theoretical or applied research.	Up to 4

	Promotes access for underserved regions and place-bound adults through distance learning and/or university centers.	Up to 4
Integral to institutional planning and goals (10 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 6
	Integral to institution's Strategic Plan. Project must be initiated soon to implement successive measures of the Strategic Plan to meet projected program requirements, growth of existing programs or demand for new programs.	Up to 4

EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Greenhouse gas emissions (2 points possible)	**Projects Requesting Predesign Funding**	
	Institution must submit documentation indicating it has adopted policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with RCW 70.235.070, and to reduce annual per capita vehicle miles per RCW 47.01.440 or RCW 43.160.020, as applicable.	Up to 2
	Projects Requesting Design Funding	
	Institution must submit documentation indicating it has adopted policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with RCW 70.235.070, and to reduce annual per capita vehicle miles per RCW 47.01.440 or RCW 43.160.020, as applicable.	Up to 1
	Identify project components or systems from predesign study that support emissions and vehicle mile reductions goals.	Up to 1

INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITY POINTS	PREDESIGN, INFRASTRUCTURE, LAND ACQUISITION	POINTS
Institutional priority (6 points possible)	**Project's priority for institution – Use once for Predesign, Infrastructure, Land**	**Select one**
	Priority number 1	6
	Priority number 2	4
	Priority number 3	2

Institutional Priority Points	Growth, Renovation, Replacement, Research	Points
Institutional priority (10 points possible)	**Project's priority for the institution – Use once across for Growth, Renovation, Replacement, Research**	**Select one**
	Priority number 1	10
	Priority number 2	8
	Priority number 3	6

Predesign request criteria (62 points possible)

Predesign Evaluation Criteria	Scoring Standard	Points
Availability of appropriate space (8 points possible)	**Addresses suitability of existing space for specific programmatic needs:**	**Additive**
	Space upgrades to meet existing program standards or needs.	0 – 6
	Space upgrades to meet future program standards or needs.	0 – 2
Space utilization (8 points possible)	**Project is associated with a campus meeting or exceeding existing HECB utilization standards:**	**Select one**
	Adds, renovates or replaces classroom space on a campus that exceeds the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and/or adds class laboratory space to a campus that exceeds the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard.	5 – 8
	Adds, renovates or replaces classroom space on a campus that does not exceed the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and/or adds class laboratory space to a campus that does not exceed the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard. Institution has a plan to achieve HECB utilization standards.	1 – 4
	Adds, renovates or replaces space on a campus that does not meet HECB utilization standards and has no plan to achieve them.	0
Condition of building (8 points possible)	**Building condition per 2010 Comparable Framework:**	**Select one**
	Not Applicable or 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)	4

DESIGN REQUEST CRITERIA

GROWTH CATEGORY (48 POINTS POSSIBLE)

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 (5 points possible)	**Addresses insufficient space on campus to accommodate projected enrollment growth.**	**Select one**
	Adds classroom space to a campus that exceeds the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and/or adds class laboratory space to a campus that exceeds the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard.	Up to 5
	Adds classroom space to a campus that does not exceed the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and/or adds class laboratory space to a campus that does not exceed the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard. Institution has a plan to achieve HECB utilization standards.	Up to 3
	Adds space to a campus that does not meet HECB utilization standards and has no plan to achieve them.	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 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.	0
	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 (59 POINTS POSSIBLE)

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 (5 points possible)	**Project renovates space on campus that meets or exceeds existing HECB utilization standards:**	**Select one**
	Renovates classroom space on a campus that exceeds the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard and/or renovates class laboratory space on a campus that exceeds the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard.	Up to 5
	Renovates classroom space on a campus that does not exceed the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard and/or renovates class laboratory space on a campus that does not exceed the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard. Institution has a plan to achieve HECB utilization standards.	Up to 3
	Renovates space on a campus that does not meet HECB utilization standards and has no plan to achieve them.	0
Condition of building or portion proposed for renovation (10 points possible)	**Building condition per 2010 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 the 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 makes compelling case and provides documentation why benchmarks are not applicable.	Up to 3
	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 (59 POINTS POSSIBLE)

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 2010 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 (5 points possible)	**Addresses insufficient space on campus to accommodate projected enrollment growth.**	**Select one**
	Adds classroom space to a campus that exceeds the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and/or adds class laboratory space to a campus that exceeds the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard.	Up to 5
	Adds classroom space to a campus that does not exceed the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and/or adds class laboratory space to a campus that does not exceed the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard. Institution has a plan to achieve HECB utilization standards.	Up to 3
	Adds space to a campus that does not meet HECB utilization standards and has no plan to achieve them.	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 (62 POINTS POSSIBLE)

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 existing research standards or needs.	Up to 3
	Space upgrades needed to meet future research standards or needs.	Up to 2
Availability of instructional space (5 points possible)	**Addresses insufficient space on campus to accommodate projected enrollment growth.**	**Select one**
	Adds classroom space to a campus that exceeds the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard, and/or adds class laboratory space to a campus that exceeds the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard.	5
	Adds classroom space to a campus that does not exceed the 22-hour per classroom seat HECB utilization standard and/or adds class laboratory space to a campus that does not exceed the 16-hour per station HECB utilization standard. Institution has a plan to achieve HECB utilization standards.	3
	Adds space to a campus that does not meet HECB utilization standards and has no plan to achieve them.	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

INFRASTRUCTURE CATEGORY (58 POINTS POSSIBLE)

Major stand-alone infrastructure projects.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING STANDARD	POINTS
Significant life safety and code issues (12 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 12 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 failures over past 5 years.	6
	Multiple failures over past 2 years.	3
	Increasing utility or maintenance costs; system unreliable.	1

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**
	Provide detailed cost estimate by applicable specialty professionals.	6
	Provide detailed cost estimate by an experienced project manager.	4
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 and Strategic Plan.	Up to 3
Resource efficiency and sustainability (8 points possible)	**Project provides documented benefits in the following areas:**	**Additive up to 8 points maximum**
	Incorporates low-impact development techniques.	0 – 3
	Improvements in energy and resource conservation.	0 – 3
	Incorporates use of alternative energy sources.	0 – 3
Greenhouse gas emissions (2 points possible)	Institution must submit documentation indicating that it has adopted policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with RCW 70.235.070, and to reduce annual per capita vehicle miles per RCW 47.01.440 or RCW 43.160.020, as applicable.	Up to 2

LAND ACQUISITION (53 POINTS POSSIBLE)

Land acquisitions not associated with a specific project.

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.**	**Select one**
	Cost per acre is 80% – 100% of average cost/acre of 2 comparables.	13 – 15
	Cost per acre is 60% – 79% of average cost/acres of 2 comparables.	10 – 12
	Cost per acre is 40% – 59% of average cost/acres of 2 comparables.	7 – 9
	Cost per acre is 20 % – 39% of average cost/acres of 2 comparables.	4 – 6
	Cost per acre is between 0 – 19% of average cost/acres of 2 comparables.	1 – 3
Intended use (5 points possible)		**Select one**
	Instructional building site.	5
	Non-instructional building site.	3
	Non-building site or no specific use determined at this time.	1
Percentage of buildable area (5 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.	5
	50% – 74% of site is buildable.	3
	Less than 50% of site is buildable.	1
	No information provided.	0
Greenhouse gas emissions (2 points possible)	Institution will submit documentation indicating that it has adopted policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with RCW 70.235.070, and to reduce annual per capita vehicle miles per RCW 47.01.440 or RCW 43.160.020, as applicable.	Up to 2

WASHINGTON STATE OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT
INSURANCE BUILDING ◆ PO BOX 43113
OLYMPIA, WA 98504-3113 ◆ (360) 902-0555 ◆ FAX (360) 664-2832