



2020 FOUR-YEAR HIGHER EDUCATION CAPITAL PROJECT EVALUATION SYSTEM

Guidelines and Submittal Instructions for
2021-23 Biennium Projects

Cover photo courtesy of Western Washington University

To accommodate persons with disabilities, this document is available in alternate formats by calling the Office of Financial Management at 360-902-0555. TTY/TDD users should contact OFM via the Washington Relay Service at 711 or 1-800-883-6388.

Visit our website at www.ofm.wa.gov

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	OVERVIEW
2	CHAPTER 1: PROJECT EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND SCHEDULE
2	Background
2	What remains the same for 2020
3	What's new for 2020
4	2020 Schedule: Key Process Dates evaluation process
4	Resources
5	CHAPTER 2: PROJECT CATEGORIES AND SCORING FRAMEWORK
5	Scoring framework
6	Capital project categories and definitions
8	CHAPTER 3: PROJECT EVALUATION AND SCORING PROCESS
8	Evaluation panels
8	Evaluation and scoring process phases
9	Evaluation process
9	Process debrief and review
10	CHAPTER 4: PROJECT PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL GUIDELINES
10	Submittal instructions and due date
10	Institutional priorities
10	Project proposal requirements
10	Proposal format
11	Content instructions
11	Overarching scoring criteria
11	General category scoring criteria
14	Criteria specific to the research category
14	Criteria specific to the infrastructure category
15	Criteria specific to the acquisition category
16	Exhibit A: Criteria matrix
17	Project proposal appendices
18	CHAPTER 5: PROJECT COST STANDARDS
18	Expected project cost range in 2019 dollars
18	Construction cost index 2020
19	Adjustment of expected cost ranges
20	CHAPTER 6: MINIMUM THRESHOLDS FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS
20	Minimum requirements for project proposals

OVERVIEW

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 2021-23. 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. It also includes descriptions of the project evaluation criteria.

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 for project submissions.

CHAPTER 1

PROJECT EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND SCHEDULE

BACKGROUND

The capital project evaluation and scoring system provides insights about the state's higher education goals with capital facility spending choices, and provides decision makers with a comprehensive and accurate analysis of the relative value of potential capital projects.

Statutory requirements. Chapter [43.88D](#) RCW mandates a process for evaluating and scoring capital project requests by the state's four-year higher education institutions. The law highlights the importance of strategic planning in the facility prioritization process, stating that the process must emphasize "objective analysis, a statewide perspective, and a strategic balance among facility preservation, new construction, and innovative delivery mechanisms."

The statute requires 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.

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 all the major projects for consideration of funding (including projects scored previously for early stages of development) during the 2021-23 biennium. Section 7032 of the 2019-21 capital budget (SHB 1102) states that OFM may, but is not obligated to, develop one prioritized list of capital projects. As a result, OFM will not compile a single prioritized list for the 2021-23 biennium.

2019 Higher Education Space and Cost Study. Section 1023, Chapter 298, Laws of 2018 directed OFM to conduct a Higher Education Facilities Study that included learning space utilization standards for higher education facilities and reasonableness of cost standards for higher education capital projects. The report was published in August 2019 with revisions in April 2020 and is available on OFM's [webpage](#). Recommendations from the study that are incorporated into the 2020 scoring process are referenced in the following sections.

OFM will request institutions provide space availability and utilization data for the requested projects in December using forms developed in the study and used to test and validate the study recommended space allocations. Information collected using these forms will **not** be used in the 2020 scoring process but will be used to assess the report findings and make decisions about space standard recommendations for future scoring processes.

WHAT REMAINS THE SAME FOR 2020

Over several biennia, the evaluation process incorporated changes that have been maintained for the evaluation process. A recap of some of those changes:

1. Institutions are required to provide a checklist with each project proposal on which they will certify the items that have been submitted.
2. Institutional priority lists will be submitted separately to OFM's higher education capital budget analyst. To ensure the evaluation of the projects is based on the merits of the proposal, the institutional priority lists will remain confidential until after the evaluation panels have completed the scoring, at which time they may be added to the total project score.
3. Enrollment access alternatives, such as university centers and distance learning, will not be a factor in any category other than growth (where such consideration is required by RCW [43.88D.010](#)).
4. Section 7029, Chapter 413, Laws of 2019, states that OFM may, but is not obligated to, develop one prioritized list of capital projects for the Legislature.
5. Section 7032, Chapter 413, Laws of 2019 requires OFM to score higher education capital project criteria with a rating scale that assesses how well a particular project satisfies criteria. In addition, OFM may not use a rating scale that weighs the importance of those criteria. For some criteria, a multiplier will be added to weight criteria equally.
6. Projected degree totals will be measured against the most current data available in [OFM Statewide Public Four-Year Dashboard](#). 2018-19 data is expected to be published in June 2020.
7. OFM cost standards will allow for consideration of higher-than-expected costs per square foot if life cycle cost savings can be demonstrated for selected systems alternatives.
8. Evaluation panels will have an orientation meeting and then two meetings to review and score project proposals.
9. OFM and Legislative staff facilitate the process but do not score the proposals.
10. Proposals for minor works and predesign phase work are not scored in this process. Requests for these are submitted as Capital Budget project requests.
11. OFM will use the existing Facility Planning and Evaluation Guide (FEPG) space utilization standards and scoring criteria for classroom and class laboratories.

WHAT'S NEW FOR 2020

Notable changes for the 2020 scoring process are:

1. Project proposals will be submitted electronically.
2. All evaluation panel meetings are anticipated to be done through tele or video conferencing.
3. Project cost range standards are updated to 2019 and are now based on maximum allowable construction cost rather than total project cost as a result of the 2018 Higher Education Facilities Study.
4. Revised program related space allocation form to reflect revised space categories and points from the 2018 Higher Education Facilities Study.
5. Projects in the stand-alone subcategory are those valued between \$2 million and \$10 million, and are separate from the major projects costing more than \$10 million. Overarching criteria will not be applied to stand-alone projects.

Any further changes deemed necessary at a later date will be issued by addendum.

2020 SCHEDULE

Key Process Dates

Action	Target date
Institutions nominate evaluation panel members	May
Capital budget instructions, Scoring process instructions and evaluation guidelines posted	June
OFM recruits evaluation panel members from other agencies and establishes evaluation panels	June
OFM publishes table with point totals for all scoring criteria	June
Predesigns due from agencies for projects (prerequisite for submitting proposals)	June 30
Institutions submit preliminary number of proposals	June 30
Informal Q&A period with agencies (OFM will forward applicable responses to all institutions)	Ongoing
Institutions submit project proposals for review and scoring process	August 15 *
Evaluation panel orientation (teleconference)	August 24
Panel members review project proposals	Aug 24 - Sept 8
Scoring meeting 1: evaluation panel members review proposals and form questions for institutions	September 8
Institution response period	September 8 - 15
Scoring meeting #2: evaluation panel members complete proposal scoring	September 16
OFM compiles scoring results	September-October
Institutions submit 2021-23 capital budget requests to OFM	September
OFM publishes scoring results and transmits to legislative fiscal committees and four-year institutions	November 1 *
Evaluation of scoring process	November
Governor's budget proposal transmitted to Legislature	December 20 *

* Statutory date

Updated: April 17, 2020

Contacts

- [Darrell Jennings](#), Capital Budget Assistant to the Governor, OFM, 360-902-3068
- [Jen Masterson](#), Senior Capital Budget Assistant to the Governor, OFM, 360-902-0579

RESOURCES

Forms, documents and links to resources needed for the scoring process are available on the Capital Projects Scoring System [webpage](#):

- Proposal checklist
- Institutional priority form
- Project proposal forms
- Availability of space / campus utilization template
- Program related space allocation template
- Degree Totals and Targets template
- C-100 cost estimating tool
- [OFM Statewide Public Four-Year Dashboard](#)
- Studies and reports

CHAPTER 2

PROJECT CATEGORIES AND SCORING FRAMEWORK

SCORING FRAMEWORK

Capital requests. Each institution should develop a capital request based upon program-based strategic planning and/or facility master planning. As required by Chapter [43.88D RCW](#) each institution should submit a prioritized list of the proposed projects for the ensuing six-year period to OFM by August 15, 2020.

Once projects are selected internally, institutions should submit a project proposal for any project expected to have a cumulative total project cost (predesign through construction) of more than \$2 million during the three biennia beginning in 2021-23.

Institutions with projects that have already been scored 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 OFM's higher education capital budget analyst about whether a change is significant enough to require that a new or amended proposal be submitted. Projects that have not been scored but have received an appropriation for predesign or design in prior biennia must be submitted for scoring (Chapter [28B.77.070 RCW](#)).

Category. Based upon the project's primary purpose, the institution must identify a scoring category (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 encompasses the majority of project square footage and/or cost. Institutions are encouraged to consult with OFM for questions about project classification.

Major or stand-alone projects. The institution should also indicate whether the project is a major project or a stand-alone project. A major project is a project with a total cumulative cost (predesign, design and construction) of more than \$10 million and generally takes two to more biennia to complete. A stand-alone project is one with a total cumulative cost of between \$2 million and \$10 million and is generally requested and completed in one biennium. Stand-alone projects will be evaluated as a subcategory under the relevant major category of growth, renovation, replacement or research.

Evaluation criteria. There are both subjective and objective evaluation measures included in the scoring criteria. Evaluation panels will interpret and score subjective criteria and OFM will provide scores for objective evaluation measures based upon information provided in the submitted materials when appropriate. Each institution should be prepared to make a strong case for how its project is in the best interest of the state. 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.

Evaluation. Each project will be evaluated and scored within one of the defined categories. In terms of scoring, capital projects will only be compared to other projects within the same category (i.e., 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.

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 projects within each of the six categories.

After the capital project requests have been scored, the Governor and Legislature will use the information generated by the higher education project evaluation process to inform and guide development of their capital budget proposals and decisions for upcoming and subsequent biennia.

CAPITAL PROJECT CATEGORIES AND DEFINITIONS

Each capital project request should be made exclusively within one of the following six categories, based on the institution's assessment of the project's primary purpose and following definitions:

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 (if such alternatives are not proposed); 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 and 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 renovated cost-effectively 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 with the primary purpose of promoting economic growth and innovation through expanded research activity should be proposed in this category, even if the project involves renovation or replacement of an existing facility. In assigning projects that serve both the research and the instructional missions, consider the percentage of assignable square feet allocated to each mission.

Infrastructure. This category is intended for major or stand-alone campus infrastructure projects that exceed the minor works threshold limit of \$2 million. These projects may be inside or outside a building. Examples of infrastructure projects include the replacement of an electrical system, installation of a new steam tunnel or the development of a water distribution system. These projects generally would be completed (pre-design through construction) in one biennium.

Acquisition. This category is intended for the acquisition of land for which no specific facility project is being proposed at this time, including the 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. For land acquisitions associated with a specific growth request, see the Growth category.

CHAPTER 3

PROJECT EVALUATION AND SCORING PROCESS

EVALUATION PANELS

Evaluation panel composition. The project evaluation and scoring process involves formation of project evaluation panels with representation from the following:

- Four-year institutions – capital facilities and academic affairs
- Council of Presidents
- Washington Student Achievement Council
- Department of Enterprise Services
- Other state agencies

Panel members play a key role in the process. Selection and panel composition is determined by OFM in consultation with legislative staff. Each institution can identify up to two individuals with capital facilities expertise and up to two individuals from academic affairs to serve as evaluators. **A prerequisite is that panel members can attend both meetings.**

OFM and legislative staff will not participate in project scoring but will facilitate the evaluation panels.

Evaluation panel guidelines. Each evaluation panel will be composed of four or five individuals who will evaluate and score a subset of the projects. The panels will operate under these guidelines:

- Panel facilitators will be composed of OFM and legislative capital budget staff. Facilitators will participate ex officio in scoring discussions, but do not score proposals.
- Panel members must participate in both scoring meetings. If a panel member is unable to attend both, his/her scoring will not be considered.
- Representatives from four-year institutions will not score proposals from their own institutions.
- Panel members will review project proposals individually, then meet to discuss and come to an agreement on the scoring.
- Panel members could evaluate and score projects in one or more categories, depending upon proposal volume.
- Panel members should not conduct their own research by contacting institutions or others about proposals.

EVALUATION AND SCORING PROCESS PHASES

Panels work through a multipart process that will take place in two meetings. Panel members should have completed a preliminary review of all proposals assigned to them for the first meeting.

OFM will distribute process instructions and project submittals to 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 about individual requests to the panel facilitator in advance of the first panel meeting. Institutions will have the opportunity to respond to panel questions in writing prior to the meeting.

Proposals should be scored objectively based on information provided by the institutions through the submittals and responses to any follow-up questions posed by the panels through OFM.

Panel meeting 1: proposal review and Q&A with facilitators

- Conduct group discussion of assigned project proposals
- Discuss application of criteria to project proposals
- Provide facilitator with any follow-up questions to institutions that panel needs for final scoring

Panel meeting 2: further review and final scoring

- Review institutions' responses to panel members' questions
- Review preliminary scores of assigned project proposals
- Agree to consensus score for each assigned project proposal

The purpose of the second meeting is to determine a final evaluation panel score for each project within each category. Evaluation panels will assign scores to each project under their review.

EVALUATION PROCESS

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

- Conduct a transparent, fair and understandable project review process.
- Provide decision makers with comprehensive and accurate analysis of how well potential capital projects satisfy the categorical criteria.
- Provide comparable information for scored proposals.
- Respond to legislative direction to OFM to coordinate the evaluation and scoring of capital facility project requests from the four-year higher education institutions.

Question and answer period. Institutions are encouraged to send questions about the scoring process to OFM at any point before evaluation panels meet. Questions and answers applicable to all institutions will then be shared.

Presentation of scoring results. Project scores, prioritized within each category, will be publicly announced by November 1, 2020. OFM will conduct 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. 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 on process, categories and evaluation criteria.

CHAPTER 4

PROJECT PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL GUIDELINES

SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS AND DUE DATE

Institutions are responsible for making sure that all required proposal packet materials are submitted to OFM by:

Document	Due date	Submit materials to
Institutional priority form	August 15, 2020	Send electronic version to: Darrell.Jennings@ofm.wa.gov
Project proposals and checklist for resubmittals	August 15, 2020	Send proposals on USB to: Office of Financial Management Attn: Darrell Jennings 302 Sid Snyder Ave SW Mailstop: 43113 Olympia, WA 98501-1342

INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES

An institutional priority form (one per institution) should 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 is available on OFM's Capital Projects Scoring System website. Institutional priorities will remain confidential until after the scoring is complete.

Priority points may be allocated among the institution's top **five capital project proposals, including both major and stand-alone projects.**

PROJECT PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

New proposals.

- Each project may only be submitted within a single category.
- Each proposal must include a signed project proposal checklist.
- **Project proposals are limited to 10 pages**, not including any supplemental and supporting documentation and appendices, such as availability of space/campus utilization form, program related space allocation form, project cost estimates, diagrams and sketches, appendices, cover sheet, title page and table of contents. Please limit to only what is necessary for scoring.

Resubmittals. Institutions with projects that have already been scored in the last two biennia do not need to submit a project proposal for scoring 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. For resubmitted projects, submit only a proposal checklist for projects previously scored and not funded that are part of an institution's budget request for biennium 2021-23.

PROPOSAL FORMAT

Project proposals should be organized in three parts:

- Brief summary description of the project
- Evaluation criteria responses:
 - Overarching evaluation criteria (if 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 forms and documentation, including technical exhibits

CONTENT INSTRUCTIONS

Each project proposal should address the following elements. See Exhibit A in Chapter 5 for scoring criteria applicability.

Summary narrative: project scope and description. Succinctly describe the proposed project, including the following information:

- Category and subcategory of project request
- Problem statement (including consequences of taking no action), short description of the project and its benefits, and a description of any alternatives considered
- History of the project or facility
- Programs addressed or encompassed by the project

OVERARCHING SCORING CRITERIA

Major project submittals in the growth, renovation, replacement and research categories will be evaluated by two overarching criteria: whether a project is integral to statewide policy goals and the extent to which the project fits within existing campus strategic and academic plans.

Integral to achieving statewide policy goals. Identify the statewide goal or goals the project addresses, 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.

The statewide goals relate to increasing the number of bachelor's and advanced degrees awarded, including bachelor's degrees in the [high-demand fields](#) identified in the [OFM Statewide Public Four-Year Dashboard](#). Use the Degree Totals and Targets template.

GENERAL CATEGORY SCORING CRITERIA

The following criteria apply to the six scoring categories. See Exhibit A for category applicability.

Promotes access. Access-related projects to accommodate enrollment growth at all campuses, at existing or new university centers, or through distance learning. Growth projects should provide significant additional student capacity. Proposed projects must demonstrate they are based on solid enrollment demand projections, more cost-effectively provide enrollment access than alternatives such as university centers and distance learning, and make cost-effective use of existing and proposed new space

Adequacy of space. Identify lack of suitable space and the upgrades needed to address program standards and needs.

Space utilization. Identify the average number of hours per week that each classroom seat and classroom lab is expected to be utilized in fall 2020 on the proposed project’s campus. If the campus does not meet the 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 2020 utilization should be estimated by increasing the fall 2019 actual enrollment by the fiscal growth factor by which the 2020-21 academic year state-supported enrollments is budgeted. Use the Availability of Space/Campus Utilization template.

Building condition. Provide the facility’s most recent condition score (1 superior–5 marginal functionality) in the 2016 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. For renovation projects only, identify whether the building is on the Washington Heritage Register, and if so, summarize its historic significance.

Efficiency of space allocation. For each major function in the proposed facility (classroom, instructional labs, offices), identify whether space allocations will be consistent with the 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.

EXAMPLE: EFFICIENCY OF SPACE ALLOCATION – FEPG STANDARD

FEPG room classification number	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 science	70	40-90	Y	
215	Class lab – services			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	140 per 4	140 per 2 min.	Y	4 student assistants = 2 FTEs
314	Clerical office	140	140	Y	2 FTEs
315	Office service, clerical station	100	100	Y	2 FTEs
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 standards, 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

FEPG room classification number	FEPG room classification type	Project ASF per station	FEPG standard	Meets standard (Y/N)	Comments
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 detailed cost estimates for the entire project, regardless of fund source. Complete and attach the Excel C-100 form for each project greater than \$5 million (RCW [43.88.030\(5\)\(i\)](#)), and complete and attach the CBS 003 cost estimates or the Excel C-100 for projects between \$2 million and \$5 million. The C-100 cost estimator in Excel aligns with the estimating in CBS 003.

If project costs exceed OFM cost standards (see Chapter 5 for reference), provide a description of any building or system alternatives that are expected to result in significant operational savings. Selected systems alternatives for which a life-cycle cost analysis shows net present savings over baseline options may receive additional points.

Program-related space allocation. Identify planned use of proposed space, including assignable square footages by use type in the Program Related Space Allocation template. Below is an example:

Type of Space	Points	Assignable square feet	Percentage of total	Score = points x percentage
Instructional space (classroom, laboratories)	10	88,483	88.4	8.84
Research space	2		0.0	0.00
Office space	4		0.0	0.00
Library and study collaborative space	10	6,729	6.7	0.67
Other non-residential space	8	3,805	3.8	0.30
Support and physical plant space	6	1,073	1.1	0.06
Total		100,090	100.0	9.88

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 a 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 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 to current life safety or energy code requirements. Clearly identify the applicable standard or code, and describe how the project will address these issues. 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 estimated number of additional FTE students the project is expected to enable the institution to serve when the space is fully occupied. Describe the method by which additional FTEs are calculated, including an analysis of probable student enrollment demand from project completion to full occupancy. Also provide an estimate of the number of additional FTE enrollments in high-demand fields and the particular fields in which such growth is expected to occur.

Per RCW [43.88D.010\(1\)\(a\)](#), growth projects must also demonstrate that they can more cost-effectively provide enrollment access than alternatives such as university centers and distance learning.

CRITERIA SPECIFIC TO THE 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 estimate the expected economic benefits of the project and provide selected 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 or business spin-offs, etc.

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

Adequacy of research space. Describe the functionality and adequacy of existing campus research space. How will the new project address any existing or planned research needs, including expanded research capability?

Contribution of other funding sources. Identify the source and amount of capital planning and construction costs that will be covered by sources other than the State Building Construction Account or State Taxable Building Construction Account. 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 include, but are 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, or 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 applicable to the scope of work and carried out by 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 or facility to be acquired and costs for two comparable acquisitions in the same area. Provide the 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 unusable 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 [2016 Comparable Framework update](#) 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 estimates of operating savings as a result of this acquisition. Present the savings in terms of years of payback of the cost of the acquisition.

EXHIBIT A – CRITERIA MATRIX

	Category	Growth	Reno.	Replace.	Research	Infrast.	Acq.
Overarching criteria: Major projects only	Increase number of bachelor's degrees	X	X	X	X	Not applicable	Not applicable
	Increase number of bachelor's degrees in high-demand fields	X	X	X	X		
	Increase number of advance degrees	X	X	X	X		
	Integral to campus/facilities master plan	X	X	X	X		
	Integral to institution's academic plan	X	X	X	X		

Category-specific scoring criteria	Promote access	X						
	Adequacy of available space		X	X	X			
	Availability of space in relation to HECB utilization standard	X	X	X	X			
	Building/ facility condition		X	X			X	
	Enrollment growth	X						
	Efficiency of space allocation in relation to FEPG	X	X	X				
	Meets building efficiency guidelines (ASF/GSF)	X	X	X				
	Reasonableness of cost	X	X	X	X	X	X	
	Program-related space allocation	X	X	X				
	Age of building or last major remodel		X	X				
	Significant health, safety and code issues		X	X		X		
	Impact on economic development					X		
	Availability of research space					X		
	Impact on innovation					X		
	Other funding sources					X		
	Integral to achieving statewide policy goals					X		
	Evidence of increased repairs/service interruption						X	
	Impact on operation without project						X	
	Engineering study						X	
	Resource efficiency and sustainability						X	
	Support by planning						X	X
	Intended use							X
	Buildable area or usable facilities							X
	Capital improvements required to adapt existing facility to proposed use							X
Savings to operating costs							X	

PROJECT PROPOSAL APPENDICES

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

- Capital project request CBS002 and either the project cost estimate CBS003 or Excel C-100 reports (required for each project proposal)
- Degree Totals and Targets template
- Program related space allocation template
- Availability of space/campus utilization template
- Degree and enrollment growth projections
- Selected excerpts from institutional plans
- Efficiency of space allocation table
- 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 nonstate 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 project

CHAPTER 5

PROJECT COST STANDARDS

EXPECTED PROJECT COST RANGE IN JANUARY 2019 DOLLARS

The following expected maximum allowable construction cost per square foot for program types are from the 2019 [Higher Education Facilities Study](#), prepared by NAC Architecture and Ayers Saint Gross.

Program type	Number of data points	Standard deviation	Expected MACC/GSF
Classrooms	31	99.84	\$405
Instructional labs	34	99.43	\$397
Research labs	8	136.36	\$545
Administration	38	96.44	\$406
Libraries	5	64.97	\$340
Athletic	3	81.53	\$385
Assembly, exhibit and meeting rooms	8	68.85	\$428

CONSTRUCTION COST INDEX 2020

The following data are based on 2020 first quarter Global Insight forecast for state and local government spending and is to be used for adjusting the expected costs from January 2019, 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
2/14/2019	1.0000	11/15/2022	1.0880	8/15/2026	1.1952	5/16/2030	1.3046
5/15/2019	1.0114	2/14/2023	1.0950	11/14/2026	1.2025	8/16/2030	1.3119
8/15/2019	1.0158	5/16/2023	1.1020	2/14/2027	1.2098	11/15/2030	1.3192
11/14/2019	1.0194	8/16/2023	1.1091	5/15/2027	1.2170	2/14/2031	1.3264
2/14/2020	1.0254	11/15/2023	1.1162	8/15/2027	1.2243	5/16/2031	1.3337
5/16/2020	1.0313	2/14/2024	1.1232	11/14/2027	1.2315	8/15/2031	1.3410
8/16/2020	1.0355	5/15/2024	1.1302	2/14/2028	1.2387	11/15/2031	1.3483
11/15/2020	1.0396	8/15/2024	1.1372	5/16/2028	1.2459	2/14/2032	1.3557
2/14/2021	1.0444	11/14/2024	1.1444	8/16/2028	1.2531	5/16/2032	1.3631
5/16/2021	1.0499	2/14/2025	1.1516	11/15/2028	1.2605	8/16/2032	1.3705
8/15/2021	1.0561	5/15/2025	1.1588	2/14/2029	1.2678	11/15/2032	1.3779
11/15/2021	1.0621	8/15/2025	1.1661	5/15/2029	1.2751	2/14/2033	1.3854
2/14/2022	1.0681	11/14/2025	1.1734	8/15/2029	1.2826	5/16/2033	1.3928
5/16/2022	1.0745	2/14/2026	1.1807	11/14/2029	1.2900	8/16/2033	1.4002
8/16/2022	1.0811	5/15/2026	1.1880	2/14/2030	1.2973		

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, 2021 (from CBS003 or Excel C-100)

End: June 1, 2023 (from CBS003 or Excel C-100)

Midpoint: July 16, 2022 (calculated)

Construction Index for Midpoint: 1.0789 (interpolated from index table: $(1.0811 - 1.0745) * 2/3 + 1.0745$)

Expected maximum allowable construction cost in 2019 dollars: \$405 (from expected cost range table)

Expected maximum allowable construction cost at construction midpoint: \$437 ($\$405 * 1.0789$)

CHAPTER 6

MINIMUM THRESHOLDS FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR PROJECT PROPOSALS

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

All categories, except infrastructure and acquisition:

- Project may not be an exclusive enterprise function such as a bookstore, dormitory or contract food service.
- Project meets LEED™ silver standard requirements, in compliance with Chapter 39.35D RCW.
- Institution has a greenhouse gas and vehicle emissions reduction policy in place, in compliance with [RCW 70.235.070](#) and [RCW 47.01.440](#).

Design phase proposals. A predesign completed in accordance with OFM's predesign manual must be on file with OFM for any project for which the institution is seeking design and/or construction funding for the 2021-23 biennium.

Growth. RCW [43.88D.010](#)(1)(a) requires growth projects to demonstrate that they are based on solid enrollment projections and that they can more cost-effectively provide enrollment access than alternatives such as university centers and distance learning.

Renovation. Project should cost between 60 and 80 percent of current replacement value and extend the useful life of the facility by at least 25 years.

Acquisition. The proposal is not to purchase land for a current facility funding request.

Infrastructure: The project is not a facility repair project.

Stand-alone projects, infrastructure and acquisition. The proposal is a single stand-alone project requesting funds in one biennium.