

HIGHER EDUCATION CAPITAL PROJECT EVALUATION SYSTEM

Overview

Section 7.1 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 2022. Key dates also are provided.

Section 7.2 describes the evaluation framework and defines project categories.

Section 7.3 outlines the evaluation process, including evaluation panel structure and process phases.

Section 7.4 includes submittal guidelines, instructions for project proposals, and a checklist for required elements. It also includes descriptions of the project evaluation criteria.

Section 7.5 provides the expected project cost ranges by type of facility and construction cost index for escalating costs to mid-construction date.

Section 7.6 lists minimum thresholds for project submissions.

7.1 Project evaluation objectives and schedule

Background

The capital project evaluation and scoring system provides insight into the state's higher education goals for capital facilities and provides decision makers with a legislatively required 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). Section 7044 of the 2021-23 capital budget (SHB 1080) states that OFM may, but is not obligated to, develop one prioritized list of capital projects. As a result, OFM will not prepare a single prioritized list for the 2023-25 biennium proposed budget.

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 final report was published in August 2019 with revisions in April 2020 and is available on OFM's [webpage](#).

What remains the same for 2022

Over several biennia, the evaluation process incorporated changes that have been maintained for this year's evaluation process. A recap of the process that remains the same follows:

1. Project proposals will be submitted and reviewed electronically.
2. Evaluation panels will have an orientation meeting and then two meetings to review and score project proposals. All meetings will be done through video conferencing. Institutions are required to provide a checklist with each project proposal on which they will certify the items that have been submitted.
3. Institutional priority lists will be submitted separately to OFM's higher education capital budget analyst and added to the results after panel scoring is complete.
4. Section 7034, Chapter 332, Laws of 2021 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. A multiplier will be added to weight criteria equally within a category.
5. Section 7044, Chapter 332, Laws of 2021, states that OFM may, but is not obligated to, develop one prioritized list of capital projects for the Legislature.
6. 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.
7. Projected degree totals will be measured against the most current data available in OFM Statewide Public Four-Year Dashboard. 2020-21 data is expected to be published by the Education Research and Data Center in August.
8. Expected project cost range standards are based on maximum allowable construction cost (MACC) rather than total project cost because of the 2019 Higher Education Facilities Study.
9. OFM cost standards allow for consideration of higher-than-expected costs per square foot if exigent circumstances can be demonstrated.
10. OFM will use the existing Facility Planning and Evaluation Guide (FEPG) space utilization standards and scoring criteria for classroom and class laboratories.
11. Proposals for minor works and predesign phase work are not scored in this process. Requests for these are submitted as Capital Budget project requests.

What's new for 2022

Notable changes for the 2022 scoring process are:

1. OFM has a new C-100 cost estimating form for 2023-25 biennium project.
2. A C-100 form is required for all submitted projects. CBS003 report is not required.
3. Revised degree target overarching scoring criteria to factor how the proposed project will contribute to an increase in degrees.
4. New template for calculating reasonableness of cost (Chapter 5).
5. Minor changes to scoring criteria.

2022 schedule

Key Process Dates

Action	Target date
Institutions nominate scoring panel members	May
Capital budget instructions, scoring process instructions and evaluation guidelines posted	June
OFM recruits scoring panel members	June - July
OFM publishes table with point totals for all scoring criteria	June
Predesigns due from agencies for projects (prerequisite for submitting proposals over \$10 million)	June 30
Institutions submit preliminary list of proposals	June 30
Informal Q&A period with agencies	Ongoing
Institutions submit project proposals and institutional priority form	August 15 *
Evaluation panel orientation/distribute proposals for review	August 22
Panel members review project proposals	Aug 22 - Sept 7
Scoring meeting 1: scoring panel members meet virtually to discuss proposals and form questions for institutions	September 7
Institution response period	September 7 - 14
Scoring meeting #2: scoring panel members meet virtually to complete scoring	September 15
OFM compiles scoring results	September - October
Institutions submit 2023-25 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	<i>Updated: May 2022</i>

Contacts

- [Jen Masterson](#), Senior Capital Budget Assistant to the Governor, OFM, (360) 810-0117

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

7.2 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, 2022.

Institutions should submit a project proposal for any project expected to have a cumulative total project cost (pre-design through construction) of more than \$2 million.

Institutions do not need to resubmit a project proposal for projects that have already been scored in a prior evaluation process 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 pre-design or design in prior biennia must still be submitted for scoring (Chapter [28B.77.070 RCW](#)).

Category. Based upon the project's primary purpose, the institution must select a scoring category (growth, renovation, replacement, research, infrastructure, or acquisition) within which it recommends the project be evaluated. Some projects may fit 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 before submission.

Major or stand-alone projects. A major project is a project with a total cumulative cost (pre-design, 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. Institutions 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.

There are two types of scoring criteria:

- **Overarching criteria:** applicable only to major projects in growth, renovation, replacement, and research categories.
- **Category-specific criteria:** applicable to all projects.

The information generated by the higher education project evaluation process is made available to inform and guide the Governor and the Legislature in their development of capital budget proposals and outyear planning.

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 for which the 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 (predesign 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.

7.2 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
- 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 for nomination/selection is that panel members can attend both meetings.**

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

- Panel facilitators will be composed of OFM, Council of Presidents, 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, their 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.
- Depending upon proposal volume, panel members may be asked to evaluate and score projects in one or more categories.
- Questions for institutions raised during panel discussions will be noted by each facilitator and submitted to the appropriate institution by OFM. 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
- Review and Q&A submitted in advance of panel meeting 1
- 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 or the process will then be shared with all.

Presentation of scoring results. Scoring results will be announced by November 1, 2022. 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.

7.4 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 (send separately from project proposal packet)	August 15, 2022	Email to: Jennifer.Masterson@ofm.wa.gov
Project proposal packets and resubmittal checklists	August 15, 2022	If file is below 20 MB, email to: Jennifer.Masterson@ofm.wa.gov . Files larger than 20 MB can be placed on an agency FTP site for download, or mailed on a thumb drive to: Office of Financial Management Attn: Jen Masterson 300 Insurance Building PO Box 43113 Olympia, WA 98504-3113

Institutional priorities

Institutions may submit a prioritized list of up to five project proposals. The institutional priority form (one per institution) is submitted electronically to the OFM higher education capital budget analyst. This form is available on OFM's Capital Projects Scoring System website. Institutional priorities will remain confidential from the evaluation panels until after their scoring process 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 scoring-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 were scored in the last two biennia and not funded, 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. To resubmit projects, institutions need only to submit a proposal checklist for projects that are part of an institution's budget request for biennium 2023-25.

Proposal packet format

Project proposals should be organized into three parts:

- Brief summary and description of the project
- Evaluation criteria responses:
 - Overarching evaluation criteria responses (if applicable): how the project addresses the statewide and the institutional planning criteria
 - Category-specific evaluation criteria responses: how the project addresses each individual evaluation criterion within the category
- Appendices: supplemental and supporting templates, forms, and documentation, including technical exhibits. Limit appendices only to materials that are relevant to information needed for scoring.

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 and submit as an appendix to the proposal packet.

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 2022 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 2022 utilization should be estimated by increasing the fall 2021 actual enrollment by the fiscal growth factor by which the 2022-23 academic year state-supported enrollments is budgeted. Use the Availability of Space/Campus Utilization template. Submit the template as an appendix to the proposal packet.

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 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.

Program-related space allocation. Identify planned use of proposed space, including assignable square footages by use type in the Program Related Space Allocation template. Submit the template as an appendix to the proposal packet.

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 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 cost estimate 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 because 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:

- Excel C-100 cost estimating tool (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

7.5 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 2022

The following data is based on 2022 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
February-19	1.0000	November-22	1.2654	August-26	1.4461	May-30	1.3073
May-19	1.0103	February-23	1.2778	November-26	1.4586	August-30	1.3146
August-19	1.0153	May-23	1.2899	February-27	1.4711	November-30	1.3219
November-19	1.0192	August-23	1.3017	May-27	1.4835	February-31	1.3291
February-20	1.0185	November-23	1.3137	August-27	1.4960	May-31	1.3364
May-20	1.0215	February-24	1.3259	November-27	1.3700	August-31	1.3437
August-20	1.0293	May-24	1.3377	February-28	1.2413	November-31	1.3511
November-20	1.0409	August-24	1.3495	May-28	1.2485	February-32	1.3585
February-21	1.0642	November-24	1.3613	August-28	1.2557	May-32	1.3659
May-21	1.0904	February-25	1.3731	November-28	1.2630	August-32	1.3733
August-21	1.1215	May-25	1.3849	February-29	1.2704	November-32	1.3807
November-21	1.1655	August-25	1.3969	May-29	1.2778	February-33	1.3882
February-22	1.2108	November-25	1.4090	August-29	1.2852	May-33	1.3956
May-22	1.2383	February-26	1.4212	November-29	1.2926	August-33	1.4031
August-22	1.2524	May-26	1.4336	February-30	1.3000	November-33	1.4105

Adjustment of expected cost ranges

Institutions should use the Reasonableness of Cost [template](#) 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 2023
End: December 2025
Midpoint: October 2024 (calculated)

Construction Index for Midpoint: 1.3535 (interpolated from index table)

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

Expected MACC at construction midpoint: \$548 ($\405×1.3535)

7.6 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 70A.45.050](#) and [RCW 47.01.440](#).

Design phase proposals. A predesign completed in accordance with OFM's predesign manual must be on file with OFM by July 1, 2022, for any project for which the institution is seeking design and/or construction funding for the 2023-25 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. Projects 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 must not purchase land for a current facility funding request.

Infrastructure. The project must not be a facility repair project.

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