

Single Prioritized List, RCW 28B.77.070

Legislative Intent. During its 2012 second special session, the Legislature reaffirmed the 4-year higher educational capital project evaluation and scoring system established in 2008 and passed Engrossed Second Substitute House Bill 2483 to place into statute the concept of a single prioritized list. Under RCW 28B.77.070, the Office of Financial Management (OFM) is directed to provide the Governor and Legislature with a single prioritized list of the major and stand-alone projects requesting funding during the 2015-17 biennium. In developing the prioritized list, the OFM is to be guided by the following criteria in the following order:

- i. the project evaluation and scoring process pursuant to 43.88D RCW;
- ii. preserving assets;
- iii. degree production; and
- iv. maximizing efficient use of instructional space.

Furthermore, the ranking of the prioritized list of capital projects may **not**:

- i. include subpriorities;
- ii. be organized by category;
- iii. assume any state bond or building account biennial funding level to prioritize the list; or
- iv. assume any specific share of projects by institution in the priority list.

Additionally, Section 7008 of the 2013-15 Capital Budget requires that OFM increase the weighting of the reasonableness of cost (RoC) criteria. Currently, the RoC weight ranges from 12% to 25% depending on the category. The RoC averages about 15% across the categories. Section 7008 also allows that projects shall be scored only once unless the OFM or the requesting school find that the project scope or budget has significantly changed. Predesigns shall not be included in the single prioritized list.

Converting to a Single Prioritized List. In consult with legislative fiscal staff, OFM has developed a purely mathematical approach to convert the project scores from the categorical scoring approach pursuant to 43.88D RCW (hereinafter referred to as Phase 1) to a single prioritized list pursuant to 28B.77.070(hereinafter referred to as Phase 2). Below is an outline of the approach followed by a conversion matrix at the end of this document.

1. Apply a conversion factor for the “Reasonableness of Cost (RoC)” score in Phase 1 to adjust the weight of RoC to be 20% of the total score regardless of the category. Applying a conversion factor to achieve a weight of 20% increases the average across the categories and ensures that RoC is weighted equally across the categories as well..
2. Take the maximum possible score adjusted to increase RoC, without priority points from Phase 1 for each category, and determine the conversion factor required to convert the score to a base of 100 to get all categories to a common reference point. This will eliminate ranking by category or subpriorities.
3. To reflect the order of priority prescribed in RCW 28B.77.070, projects that **preserve assets** shall receive 15 points (or 0 if not applicable). Renovations and Infrastructure projects will rank higher under this criterion.
4. Projects that increase **degree production** will receive a maximum of 10 points (or 0 if not applicable). This will be determined by converting the points received for the criteria “Integral to Achieving Statewide Policy Goals” (maximum 13 points). Since intermediate projects are not scored on these criteria, they will receive 0 points.
5. Scoring **efficient use of instructional space**: This will be a calculation based on the efficiency percentage found on Form CBS002. Science facilities will receive an additional 5% as they do in the Ph. 1 scoring process. The resulting efficiency percentage will then be weighted for a maximum score of 5 (or 0 if not applicable, e.g. an Infrastructure project or

land acquisition). Since little programming has been done prior to a request for predesign funding, predesign projects will also receive 0 points in this category.

6. In the event of a tie, the rank will be determined by the respective project scores from Phase 1, excluding the institutional priority points. One-tenth of a point will be added to the higher scoring project from Phase 1 to establish the rank order between the tied projects on the single prioritized list.

Release of the Single Prioritized List. Release of the single prioritized list is not dictated by statute. Consequently, the release date shall be determined by the Governor but shall be no later than start of the 2015 Legislative Session.

2015-17 Single Prioritized List Conversion Matrix

CATEGORY		MAXIMUM POSSIBLE POINTS						
		Phase 1 Categorical Scoring 43.88D RCW w/Adj RoC ¹	Conversion Factor to Scale of 100	Common Baseline	Preserving Assets ²	Degree Production	Max. Efficient Use of Instructional Space	Maximum Converted Score
MAJOR	GROWTH	77.5	1.29	100	0	10	5	115.0
	RENOVATION	91.0	1.10	100	15	10	5	130.0
	REPLACEMENT	91.0	1.10	100	0	10	5	115.0
	RESEARCH	100.0	1.00	100	0	10	5	115.0
STAND-ALONE	GROWTH	51.0	1.96	100	0	0	5	105.0
	RENOVATION	65.0	1.54	100	15	0	5	120.0
	REPLACEMENT	65.0	1.54	100	0	0	5	105.0
	RESEARCH	75.0	1.33	100	0	0	5	105.0
	INFRASTRUCTURE	59.0	1.69	100	15	0	0	115.0
	PREDESIGN	58.0	1.72	100	0	0	0	100.0
	LAND/ACQUISITION	46.0	2.17	100	0	0	0	100.0

¹Maximum possible points excluding institutional priority points and adjusting “Reasonableness of Cost” weight to 20%.

²Projects that combine a renovation and addition shall receive points for preserving assets based on the percentage of the total project square footage that is renovation.