

**October 6, 2016 update on the work of the WACTC task force created to develop recommendations related to the major capital project selection process by December 1, 2016.**

**Task Force Members:**

**Chad Stiteler**, Bellingham Technical College, Business Affairs Commission  
**Choi Halladay**, Pierce College District, Business Affairs Commission  
**Jason Francois**, Shoreline Community College, Operations and Facility Council  
**Tim Wheeler**, Lake Washington Institute of Technology, Operations and Facility Council  
**Tomas Ybarra**, Yakima Valley Community College, Instruction Commission  
**Jeff Wagnitz**, Highline College, Instruction Commission  
**Lin Zhou**, Bates Technical College, Student Services Commission  
**Jack Huls**, Peninsula College, Student Services Commission  
**Ty Jones**, Columbia Basin College, Research and Planning Commission  
**Heather Knous-Westfall**, Renton Technical College, Research and Planning Commission  
**Wayne Doty**, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges  
**Devin DuPree**, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges

**Charge and Status**

**Enrollment Projections** – review methodology and how State Board’s baseline projections are presented to reduce subjectivity in scoring college projections. Include more information about how colleges might affect outcomes. Maybe provide some examples.

*The task force is working on guidance for preparing and evaluating enrollment projections. The State Board would provide baseline enrollment projections in March/April. A small RPC group would provide feedback to colleges on their alternative enrollment projections by July 2017.*

**Utilization Reporting** – review methodology and streamline reporting. Make sure block teaching arrangements, as are common at technical colleges, are fairly represented.

*The task force found 25Live is not yet used by every college nor does it have the level of flexibility that is allowed for in our adopted methodology. The technical colleges that submitted proposal for 2017-19 will provide additional guidance on how to correctly represent space capacity and contact hours for block instruction to the guidance that was included with the 2017-19 criteria. The task force is recommending colleges work with State Board staff to calculate utilization by July 2017 for use in development of their proposals.*

**Unintended Consequences** – make sure the ongoing maintenance and repair of buildings does not detract from major project scoring in an un-intended way.

*The task force reviewed the intent of the major project selection criteria and then looked for evidence that a) any college had neglected a building in order to improve a future proposal’s score and b) if a college could have a building that was in “too good” of condition to score well but still did not meet programmatic needs. The task force found no evidence that ongoing maintenance and repair of buildings detracted from major project scoring in an un-intended way. Minor program project did not have a significant effect on a building’s overall facility score. And, there was no evidence that colleges have neglected buildings or manipulated facility condition scores to improve proposal scoring.*

**October 6, 2016 update on the work of the WACTC task force created to develop recommendations related to the major capital project selection process by December 1, 2016.**

**Complexity** – look at changes in process or materials to reduce complexity or improve understanding of the category weighting.

*The task force has not specifically looked at this issue. It will be addressed after other changes are incorporated into the criteria.*

**Relative Difficulty of Each Category** – review previous scoring results and other data to assure points are equally hard to get in each category.

*The task force found points for the renovation, replacement and new area portions of proposals from 2015-17 and 2017-19 selections were equally hard to get. The primary evidence for this was the top three proposals in 2017-19 were renovation, replacement and new area projects. However, the actual points earned for new area tended to be lower because colleges generally did not have the level of growth necessary to receive higher scores. The task force also performed statistical analysis on the 2017-19 scores and identified four criteria that could be improved by providing additional guidance in the criteria, like what is meant by “partnerships with K-12, 4yrs business, etc...” in the Overarching criteria.*

**Follow New Predesign Format and Content** – look at changes in structure and content of the Project Request Report to keep it aligned with OFM’s new predesign guidelines. This will assure a project funded for design can build on the work in PRR for the predesign.

*The task force found the following changes were needed to conform to new predesign guidelines; reduce number of sections from 14 to 6; move information about how the project relates to goals into the Problem Statement; add a new requirement to include a cost estimate for each alternative; and move LEED checklist from the list of optional to mandatory attachments. They also found the opportunity to delete the redundant requirement to identify funding sources in the Capital Cost Development section; delete redundant requirement for schedule information in the Schedule section; and delete unnecessary requirement for information on budget timing and college priority.*

**Master Plan Cost** – look at developing a methodology for colleges to easily and consistently estimate the cost over the next ten years for their facility master plan. If submitted with college major project requests, this could be used to illustrate our system’s long term capital funding needs for decision makers.

*To see if a methodology could be designed to use available information, the task force surveyed colleges to find out if each college had a facility master plan and the level of detail in those that do. The survey found only one-half of the 27 colleges that responded had ten, or more, years remaining in their current plans; 90% had only five years remaining. Almost all of the plans included renovation and replacement based on the condition of existing facilities but only 85% included future facility needs based on enrollment growth. Only about half of the common infrastructure elements were included in the plans. Based on the survey results, the task force is working on a methodology to price the ten year facility needs.*

**October 6, 2016 update on the work of the WACTC task force created to develop recommendations related to the major capital project selection process by December 1, 2016.**

**Past versus New Growth** – look at changes in relative weighting of Utilization and Enrollment Projections to give equal opportunity to projects based on past enrollment growth and to projects based on projected growth. Consider splitting past and new growth into two separate categories relative to the additional complexity of the scoring process.

*The task force is working on a significant change to the New Area criteria to eliminate the timing of growth from the potential score. This approach has colleges project their utilization ten years into the future based on projected enrollment and the number of lab and classroom workstations to be added in the proposed project. See separate handout with 2017-19 and draft 2019-21 criteria.*

**Scope Changes after Scoring** – clarify what scope should not be changed after a project is added to the pipeline and what the consequences are for improperly changing the scope.

*The task force has discussed this and has not yet reached consensus on the appropriate principle. One principle is a project should not change things that would have directly changed the proposal's score. The competing principle is that it takes so long to go from proposal to completion of a project; a college needs total flexibility to change the project after it has been added to the pipeline.*

**Exterior Circulation** – look at how to include the area of existing exterior circulation in the allowable replacement area so it does not have to be justified as net new area when circulation is moved into the building.

*The task force thinks the area of a replacement project should be allowed to be bigger than the building area being replaced by an amount equal to the exterior circulation area of the building being replaced. The exterior circulation area is the length of each exterior wall that has at least one classroom door that is the only student-access to the classroom, times ten-feet.*

This page intentionally left blank

**2017-19 New Area Points**  
(used when project has a net increase in area)

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Scoring Standard</b>	
Enrollment trends (Projected change in FTE for entire college. Scoring of this may be based on college or State Board projections at the scorer's discretion.)	Over 100 FTE/year	<b>22</b>
	76 – 99 FTE/year	<b>19</b>
	50 – 75 FTE/year	<b>17</b>
	36 – 49 FTE/year	<b>12</b>
	26 – 35 FTE/year	<b>7</b>
Efficient use of new area (Project net new gross square footage divided by projected change in FTE.)	GSF/FTE is less than or equal to 125.	<b>6</b>
	GSF/FTE is greater than 125 and less than 140	<b>4</b>
	GSF/FTE is at least 140 and no more than 165	<b>2</b>
	GSF/FTE is greater than 165	<b>0</b>
Efficient use of existing space – utilization  (See Appendix C for guidelines on determining utilization.)	If Lab utilization was at least 18 and Class utilization was at least 24.	<b>6</b>
	If Lab utilization was at least 16 but less than 18 and Class utilization was at least 22 but less than 24	<b>3</b>
	If either Lab utilization was less than 16 or Class utilization was less than 22.	<b>0</b>
Comprehensive project planning for new area	<i>Add up points from each category: (Max 24)</i>	
	Space improves program delivery and student support	<b>Up to 10</b>
	Programs and student support space are identified by usage and square footage	<b>Up to 5</b>
	Location of project is identified by site	<b>2</b>
	Special initiatives beyond participation rates	<b>2</b>
	Reasonable cost estimate and building efficiency	<b>3</b>
Reasonableness of cost of the new area – efficient utilization of funds (Building being proposed)	<i>Add up points from each category: (Max 19)</i>	
	Project Cost/Projected Net new FTE due to project, relative to other proposals.	<b>2</b>
	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. See Appendix B.	<b>17</b>
	Project cost is between 100% and 111% of expected cost.	<b>12</b>
	Project cost is between 111% and 137% of expected cost.	<b>5</b>
	Project cost is more than 137% of expected cost.	<b>0</b>
New Area Subtotal (N1)		
New Area Weighting (N2)		
New Area Weighted Subtotal (N3 = N1 x N2)		
New Area Portion of Project (N4)		
<b>New Area Points (N5 = N3 x N4)</b>		

**2019-21 New Area Points**  
(used when project has a net increase in area)

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		<b>Scoring Standard</b>		Now based on future utilization. Replaces enrollment trend, efficient use of new area, efficient use of existing space, and project cost per projected net new FTE criteria.
(See Appendix C for guidelines on determining future utilization.)	Efficient use of space – future utilization	If either Lab utilization will be more than 17 or Class utilization will be more than 23.	<b>12</b>	}
		If Lab utilization will be at least 15 but less than 17 and Class utilization was at least 21 but less than 23	<b>24</b>	
		If Lab utilization was at least 12 but less than 15 and Class utilization was at least 19 but less than 21	<b>12</b>	
		If either Lab utilization will be less than 12 or Class utilization will be less than 19.	<b>0</b>	
Program related improvements in the new area portion of the project	<i>(Assignable Square Feet)</i>	<i>Percentage of total</i>	<i>x score</i>	<i>Total</i>
	Classroom, labs		<b>12</b>	} New criterion for New Area. Identical to Replacement criterion.
	Student Services		<b>12</b>	
	Library		<b>12</b>	
	Childcare		<b>9</b>	
	Faculty offices		<b>7</b>	
	Administrative		<b>5</b>	
	Maintenance/Central Stores/Student Center		<b>2</b>	
Comprehensive project planning for new area	<i>Add up points from each category: (Max 24)</i>			
	Space improves program delivery and student support	Programs and student support space are identified by usage and square footage		
	Location of project is identified by site	Special initiatives beyond participation rates	<b>2</b>	
	Reasonable cost estimate and building efficiency	Expected building life – 50 years or greater	<b>2</b>	
			<b>2</b>	
			<b>2</b>	
			<b>3</b>	
Reasonableness of cost of the new area – efficient utilization of funds (Building being proposed)	<i>Add up points from each category: (Max 17)</i>			}
	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. See Appendix B.		<b>17</b>	
	Project cost is between 100% and 111% of expected cost.		<b>12</b>	
	Project cost is between 111% and 137% of expected cost.		<b>5</b>	
	Project cost is more than 137% of expected cost.		<b>0</b>	
New Area Subtotal (N1)				
New Area Weighting (N2)				
New Area Weighted Subtotal (N3 = N1 x N2)				
New Area Portion of Project (N4)				
<b>New Area Points (N5 = N3 x N4)</b>				