

**Building Board**  
**Capital Development Request Evaluation Guide**

Approved July 14, 2004

	<b>Strategic Objectives</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Scoring Anchors</b>
1	Address life safety and other deficiencies in existing assets through renewal and replacement	Does the project address documented code and condition deficiencies? For life safety deficiencies, what is the potential impact and probability of occurrence?	3	5 = documented cost of deficiencies exceeds 60% of total project cost 3 = documented cost of deficiencies between 30% and 45% of total project cost 1 = documented cost of deficiencies is less than 15% of total project cost 0 = project does not address an existing facility <b>-and-</b> ↑↑ if substantial threat to life and property <u>and</u> higher probability of occurrence ↑ if substantial threat to life and property <u>or</u> higher probability of occurrence
2	Address essential program growth requirements	Does the increase in space address documented growth of the essential program and to what degree are other needs/desires added onto the request?	2	5 = increased space is well supported by demographics for existing demand plus a reasonable allowance for future growth for the essential program 3 = increased space is supported by demographics for existing demand and growth for the essential program while also incorporating other needs. 1 = increased space significantly exceeds the level justified by demographics or no demographics are provided 0 = project does not result in an increase in space
3	Cost effective solutions	Does the project reflect a cost effective solution appropriate to the facility need? Is this a “bargain” with a limited window of opportunity?	3	5 = Alternative approach that is substantially less costly to the State in the long term than a standard approach 3 = Cost effective solution appropriate to the facility 0 = More costly than is appropriate for the facility need <b>-then-</b> ↑ if this is a bargain opportunity that requires immediate action or it will be lost
4	Improve program effectiveness and/or capacity	To what degree does the project improve program effectiveness or increase program capacity other than the simple addition of space?	2	4 = substantial improvement in program effectiveness 2 = moderate improvement in program effectiveness <b>-and-</b> ↑ if significant increase in program capacity ↓ if minor increase in program capacity
5	Provide facilities necessary to support critical programs and initiatives	Is the project required to support a critical state program or initiative?	2	5 = project is required for an essential state program or initiative to operate 3 = project is needed to support an important state program 1 = project enhances a less critical state program
6	Take advantage of alternative funding opportunities for needed facilities	What portion of the total project cost is covered by alternative funds?	1	5 = more than 60% 3 = between 20% and 40% 1 = no alternative funding is available for this program <b>-then-</b> ↑ if alternative funding (excluding donations) requires state funding this budget cycle

1. Scoring is on a scale of 0 to 5 using whole numbers only with the scoring anchors identifying specific points on this scale.
2. ↑ and ↓ indicate that one point may be added or subtracted. This adjustment will not be made if it would cause the score to be greater than 5 or less than 0.
3. The scores for each criterion are multiplied by the weighting factor and summed to arrive at a total score.
4. Please see the attached additional information and instructions.

**Building Board**  
**Capital Development Request Evaluation Guide**  
**Additional Information/Instructions**

The following additional information and instructions are provided to aid in the application of the evaluation guide. The strategic objectives are broad objectives of the State as a whole which have an impact on facility needs. The criteria interpret each objective and identify the discriminating factor that differentiates the degree to which each request satisfies the strategic objective. The scoring anchors define specific points on the range of possible scores to facilitate consistent application. A project's score is determined by multiplying the score for each objective by the applicable weighting factor. These amounts are then summed to arrive at the total score. The total score indicates how well the project meets the objectives as a whole.

Clarification of how each objective should be scored is provided below.

Objective 1 – Address life safety and other deficiencies in existing assets through renewal and replacement

This objective measures the degree to which a project takes care of deficiencies in existing state-owned facilities. The measurement utilizes the information obtained through DFCM's facility condition assessment program. In consultation with DFCM, this may be supplemented by information obtained through other sources such as additional engineering studies or professional staff analysis.

In order to prevent a relatively small problem from justifying a much larger project, this measurement is calculated by dividing the cost of correcting deficiencies by the total cost of the requested project. The only deficiencies considered in this calculation are those that will be resolved directly through the requested project. This objective addresses basic deficiencies in the building and its systems. The cost of correcting programmatic deficiencies is not considered in this objective but is addressed in objective 4. An example of a programmatic deficiency is a space reconfiguration that is desired to improve space utilization or program effectiveness.

Additional points may be awarded based on the potential impact of life safety deficiencies and their probability of occurrence as noted in the scoring anchors. If the project addresses both existing space as well as an increase in space, the score resulting from the above calculation will need to be adjusted as explained below.

Objective 2 – Address essential program growth requirements

This objective evaluates the degree to which the requested increase in state-owned space is supported by demographic information. Due to the wide variety in types of requests submitted, it is anticipated that the requesting agency or institution will identify the most appropriate demographic data to support its request. The validity and completeness of the demographic support will be considered in evaluating the requested scope. In developing

its suggested score, DFCM may obtain and consider additional demographic data beyond that which is submitted with the request. If the project addresses both existing space as well as an increase in space, the score resulting from the above calculation will need to be adjusted as explained below.

#### Objectives 1 and 2 Scoring Adjustment

For projects that involve both an increase in space and the renovation or replacement of existing state-owned space, the scores for objectives 1 and 2 must be reduced by the same proportion as the project cost associated with the existing facility or the increase in space, as applicable, is to the total project cost.

The following example is provided to demonstrate this calculation. Assume that 80% of a requested project replaces an existing facility and 20% of the project creates an increase in space beyond that contained in an existing facility. Assume further that substantial problems are documented in the existing building that is being replaced that are sufficient to justify a score of 5. This score would then be reduced to a final score of 4.0 through the following calculation:  $5 * 0.8 = 4$ . Assume also that the demographic support for the increased space justifies a score of 4. This score would then be reduced to a final score of 0.8 through the following calculation:  $4 * 0.2 = 0.8$ . The results of these adjustments should be rounded to one decimal place.

#### Objective 3 – Cost effective solutions

This objective measures the cost effectiveness of the request. It is expected that most projects will receive a score of “3”. Windows of opportunity will be evaluated to assure their validity.

#### Objective 4 – Improve program effectiveness and/or capacity

This objective addresses the degree to which a project improves the effectiveness or capacity of a program. Capacity increases will be evaluated based on quantity of service that can be provided in a given amount of space. Capacity increases that are only the result of an increase in space will not be considered.

#### Objective 5 – Provide facilities necessary to support critical programs and initiatives

This objective seeks to measure the degree to which a request supports critical programs or initiatives. It is not addressing the level of support for a specific project. The scoring anchors address the criticality of the program or initiative and the degree to which the project is required in order for that program or initiative to operate.

#### Objective 6 – Take advantage of alternative funding opportunities for needed facilities

This objective addresses the degree to which alternative funding reduces the funding impact on the state. A bonus point may be awarded for alternative funding (other than donations) that has a timing constraint requiring that state funds be provided in the current budget cycle.