Chapter 7

HIGHER EDUCATION CAPITAL PROJECT EVALUATION SYSTEM

7.1 Higher education scoring - background and updates

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.

New **The 2023-25 capital budget suspended the higher education scoring process** for the 2023-25 and the 2025-27 biennia. Instead of these requirements, **the public four-year institutions of higher education must submit additional supporting information for major project funding requests for the 2025-27 biennium**, to be submitted as attachments along with the institution's capital budget requests due by **Tuesday**, **September 10, 2024**.

1. Space efficiency
   a. Space utilization – "Availability of Space" tab
   b. Efficiency of space – "Efficiency of Space Allocation" tab
2. Reasonableness of project cost – "Reasonableness of Cost" tab
3. Building/facility condition – "Condition of Building" tab
4. Enrollment growth/anticipated impacts of the requested major projects on projected degree totals – "Enrollment Growth" tab

See additional details on each element below. For questions, contact Kelsey Rote, Capital Budget Advisor to the Governor, OFM.

7.2 Project proposal submittal guidelines

Submittal instructions and due date

As attachments within CBS alongside agency budget requests, please submit the following for each project expected to have a cumulative total project cost (predesign through construction) of more than $2 million:

Space utilization. Identify the average number of hours per week that each classroom seat and classroom lab is expected to be utilized in fall 2024 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 2024 utilization should be estimated by increasing the fall 2023 actual enrollment by the fiscal growth factor by which the 2024-25 academic year state-supported enrollments is budgeted.

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. Attach any necessary supporting documentation to your CBS submittal.

*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 detailed cost estimates for the entire project, regardless of fund source. Complete and attach the Excel C-100 form for each project. 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.

Enrollment growth. 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 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.

7.3 Project cost standards

Expected project cost range in January 2019 dollars

The following expected maximum allowable construction cost (MACC) 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 2024

The construction cost index is based on the S&P Global Market Intelligence February 2024 U.S. Economic Outlook and is to be used for adjusting the expected costs from January 2019 to the mid-construction date for comparison to project estimates. Please see the "Construction Cost Index" tab in the higher education Excel file attachment.

Adjustment of expected cost ranges

Institutions should use the Reasonableness of Cost tab to calculate the expected weighted-average cost of the proposed project at the mid-point of construction.

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

Facility Type: Classrooms

Construction Dates:

Start: August 2025

End: December 2027

Midpoint: October 2026 (calculated)

Construction Index for Midpoint: 1.4509 (from index tab)

Expected MACC in 2019 dollars: $405 (from expected cost range table above)

Expected MACC at construction midpoint: $588 ($405*1.4509)