

1/19/2017

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

I.3. Capital Planning and Budget Committee

Thursday, February 2, 2017
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.
Union South, Varsity Hall I
UW-Madison
Madison, Wisconsin

- a. Approval of the Minutes of the December 8, 2016 Meeting of the Capital Planning and Budget Committee
- b. UW System: Approval of the UW-Madison Health Science Library Center Academic Affairs Curriculum Enhancement Project
[Resolution I.3.b.]
- c. UW System: Approval of the UW-Madison School of Business Learning Commons Project
[Resolution I.3.c.]
- d. UW System: Approval of the Criteria for Ranking Building Projects
[Resolution I.3.d.]
- e. UW-Madison Campus Master Plan Update: Extending our History – Embracing our Future
- f. Report of the Associate Vice President
 1. State Building Commission Actions
 2. Other Updates

Approval of the UW-Madison Health
Science Learning Center Academic Affairs
Curriculum Enhancement Project,
UW System

CAPITAL PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

Resolution:

That, upon the recommendation of the President of the University of Wisconsin System, authority be granted to complete the design and construction of the UW-Madison Health Science Learning Center Academic Affairs Curriculum Enhancement project for a total estimated cost of \$16,025,264 Gift Funds.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

**REQUEST FOR
BOARD OF REGENTS ACTION
FEBRUARY 2017**

INSTITUTION: UW System on behalf of the University of Wisconsin-Madison

REQUEST: Approval to complete the design and construction of the Health Sciences Learning Center Academic Affairs Curriculum Enhancement project at a total estimated cost of \$16,025,264 Gift Funds.

DESCRIPTION: The project will design and renovate approximately 80,000 SF of floors 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Health Science and Learning Center (HSLC) to enhance the teaching, administrative, and public space for Academic Affairs. This project will include roughly 7,000 SF of quiet student study lounge, 12,000 SF clinical assessment area, a new active learning space of 13,500 SF that is subdividable into multiple rooms, renovation of strategic office spaces including those of Multi-Cultural Affairs and the Native American Center for Health Professions (NACHP), and upgrades to conference rooms throughout the building. The HVAC system will also be expanded and improved to handle new occupancy loads and functions. Additionally, access controls and security enhancements will be evaluated and designed in coordination with the School of Medicine and Public Health (SMPH) Security Task Force, which includes the UW-Madison Police Department.

JUSTIFICATION: The Health Science Learning Center is in the process of significantly changing the medical student curriculum. A four-year integration of basic, public health, and clinical sciences will emphasize continuing competency development and a tight alignment between these three newly-designed phases of education.

The Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) accredits medical education programs leading to the MD degree in the United States and Canada. An LCME survey site visit is expected to occur in April 2018 following the curriculum changes. The schedule below is set with the intent to complete all critical construction work prior to the April 2018 new curriculum and accreditation site visit.

SCHEDULE:

A/E Selection	October 2016
Begin Design	December 2016
BOR Approval	February 2017
Bid Opening	April 2017
Begin Construction	June 2017
Occupancy	April 2018
Construction Complete/ LCME Visit	June 2018

BUDGET:

	Per Program	Per Design
Construction:	\$11,327,577	\$11,327,577
A/E Fees:	\$1,500,850	\$1,500,850
Equipment:	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
Contingency:	\$1,621,837	\$1,621,837
Other Fees:	\$75,000	\$75,000
Total Project Cost:	\$16,025,264	\$16,025,264

PREVIOUS ACTION: None.

Approval of the UW-Madison School of
Business Learning Commons Project,
UW System

CAPITAL PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

Resolution:

That, upon the recommendation of the President of the University of Wisconsin System, authority be granted to complete the design and construction of the UW-Madison School of Business Learning Commons project for a total estimated cost of \$10,082,266 Gift Funds.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

**REQUEST FOR
BOARD OF REGENTS ACTION
FEBRUARY 2017**

INSTITUTION: UW System on behalf of the University of Wisconsin–Madison

REQUEST: Approval to complete the design and construction of the School of Business Learning Commons project for a total estimated cost of \$10,082,266 Gift Funds.

DESCRIPTION: The project will design and renovate approximately 33,130 SF across three floors of library, classroom, and computer lab space within the existing five-story Grainger Hall. The remodeling will take place on the interior of the first three floors while the rest of the building remains functional. A two-level stair will be extended to the third floor to simplify the vertical circulation. The HVAC system will also be reconfigured and improved to handle the new layouts. New audio visual equipment will be designed to support the active learning classrooms and the Finance and Analytics Lab.

The first floor will provide an updated Huber Lab with a finance and analytics area within and space for the building's copy and print center. The updated space of the Business Library on the second floor will include student-centric study areas with options for both focused and collaborative work as well as a casual open space that can be used for presentations and discussions. Five new flexible active learning classrooms, which can be reconfigured and combined for larger functions, will be created for the Business Learning Center. The third floor of the Learning Commons will be an environment dedicated to student study space with updated furniture options. Additional enclosed breakout spaces will be added to allow for collaborative team work.

JUSTIFICATION: The existing library, Business Learning Center, and Huber Lab were built in 1993. Most of the spaces have experienced minimal change since their construction. The existing space has become outdated and doesn't support an active learning pedagogy. The library, which functions as one of the most popular campus libraries, needs to be updated to align with current uses and trends. The existing second floor Business Learning Center currently operates in a space adjacent to the library that was not originally intended for classrooms use, so it is not ideal for teaching or active learning. The Huber Lab is underutilized, inflexible, and lacks the current technology needed for students learning to learn about financial markets. Another project goal is to improve wayfinding to correct the lack of visibility and connection between the laboratory's spaces.

SCHEDULE:

A/E Selection	September 2016
Begin Design	October 2016
BOR Approval	February 2017
Bid Opening	July 2017
Begin Construction	September 2017
Occupancy	April 2018
Construction Complete	June 2018

1/26/2017

Agenda Item I.3.c.

BUDGET:

	Per Program	Per Design
Construction:	\$6,727,900	\$6,723,842
Contingency:	\$908,300	\$908,300
A/E Fees:	\$629,700	\$557,000
Moveable Equipment:	2,051,949	\$1,893,540
Total Project Cost:	\$10,320,000	\$10,082,266

PREVIOUS ACTION: None.

Approval of the Criteria for Ranking
Building Projects, UW System

CAPITAL PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

Resolution:

That, upon the recommendation of the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Criteria for Evaluating Major Capital Projects be adopted as the basis for prioritizing major capital projects for inclusion in UW System capital budget requests.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS

BACKGROUND

Wisconsin Statutes require that projects constructing new space and exceeding \$760,000 be approved by the Legislature, regardless of fund source(s). Generally, such projects are presented and adopted in the biennial capital budget. Maintenance and remodeling projects may be constructed through the All Agency program, within the total amount approved by the legislature for such purposes.

The two primary sources of funding for UW System capital projects are state support through General Fund Supported Borrowing (GFSB) for academic facilities and university support through Program Revenue and Program Revenue Supported Borrowing (PRSB) for student life facilities. Other fund sources can include agency funds, and gifts and grants. 2015 Wisconsin Act 55 now permits the Board of Regents to undertake development of projects fully funded by gifts and grants.

The need for academic facility improvements at UW System institutions far exceeds the amount of available state support each biennium. Therefore, the UW System and the Board of Regents must prioritize the capital projects requested by institutions. In the past, only projects that required GFSB were scored and ranked through this prioritization process. Program revenue projects funded by activities that generate sufficient revenue were not ranked if they met long-range plan guidelines and demonstrated supportable operating and capital funding streams.

Other maintenance or remodeling projects may be constructed through the statewide All Agency fund. Such projects are also screened and prioritized before submission to the Division of Facilities Development and the State Building Commission.

The Board of Regents approves the criteria used by System Administration staff to prioritize proposed major projects that require enumeration by the legislature. The use of approved criteria in preparing capital budget submissions was established in 1999-2001, and the criteria have been updated to reflect current systemwide initiatives, priorities, and goals of the Board of Regents. The intended use of these criteria is to create a priority list that addresses the greatest needs, highest academic priorities, and most cost-effective solutions to established facility deficiencies.

REQUESTED ACTION

Adoption of Resolution I.3.e., authorizing the use of revised criteria for ranking major projects for enumerated consideration.

DISCUSSION

The proposed criteria for ranking major capital projects emphasize extending the useful life of existing facilities and their functionality. The criteria also focus on improving the quality of education by providing effective teaching and learning environments with appropriate technology. Strong consideration is given to projects offering operating efficiencies. The priority of each project, as established by the respective chancellor, is the primary institutional differentiating component of the ranking process. All general fund projects requiring enumeration must be supported by a completed capital plan.

Significant evaluation factors include a strong emphasis on facility reuse, innovation, and the impact on infrastructure and maintenance. Preference is given to projects that improve space utilization, reduce maintenance costs, promote facility reuse, and improve program functionality.

As part of the President's Reform Agenda, which reinforces the existing Regent policy of emphasizing the importance of considering renovation before construction of new space, an intermediate prerequisite process is now included to evaluate major project requests that propose new net square footage. Each project must meet the criteria delineated in one of these categories, as well as demonstrate that no other appropriate facilities are available to accommodate expansion before it can move through the remaining steps of the evaluation process.

The criteria are attached. The proposed changes to the criteria language are mostly intended to clarify intent and reflect how the criteria are applied during the evaluation of proposed project requests. The following proposed changes are more significant than mere clarification of intent.

There are two proposed modifications to the **Capital Project Prerequisites** category and **Institutional Readiness** criteria:

- For organizational purposes, wholly merge Institutional Readiness and Operational Support content under one criterion, titled Institutional Readiness. This merger maintains the same previous criteria considerations and only eliminates Operational Support as an individually titled criterion. Projects will continue to be evaluated regarding whether the university has identified and documented appropriate and adequate operational resources to operate and maintain a requested capital asset(s).
- Modify the Institutional Readiness criteria to include the importance of a fully documented six-year institutional capital plan as a context for evaluating project requests.

There is one proposed modification to the **Institutional Priority** category and all four of its criteria (three related to **Highest Rank** and one related to **Project Sequence**):

- Modify the criteria to illustrate the importance and requirement of a fully documented six-year institutional capital plan as the context for all individual project request evaluations.

Given the magnitude of capital budget needs, each major project proposal will be ranked using the recommended criteria. The rankings assist in determining which projects are recommended to the Board of Regents for inclusion in the 2019-2021 Capital Budget.

System Administration has not yet received capital budget instructions from the Department of Administration for the 2019-2021 biennium. Additional guidelines, which may be established by the Department of Administration, will be addressed in the context of this framework.

RELATED REGENT POLICY DOCUMENTS

None.

**THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS EVALUATION CRITERIA (REVISIONS)**

PART I: These evaluation criteria apply to all requests for new assignable* square footage, regardless of funding source(s). Project requests seeking to add additional assignable square footage **must meet at least one of the following four criteria** to advance further for capital budget consideration. If the net new square footage‡ prerequisite is satisfied, then the project request will continue through the remaining evaluation criteria and process. Each institution must provide demonstrated proof that no other appropriate facilities are available to accommodate the proposed expansion needs.

* Assignable square footage does not include any circulation; restrooms; mechanical or electrical rooms; structural areas; or building service areas.

‡ Net new square footage does not include replace-in-kind, even if the replacement space is larger than the original space due to current construction and facility standards and practices. This only applies to new square footage purely for program creation or expansion purposes.

SCORING	NET NEW SQUARE FOOTAGE PREREQUISITE	4 Criteria
Yes or No	FACILITY STANDARDS AND COMPLIANCE: The institution has demonstrated and documented building codes and/or standards compliance issues and/or health, safety, and environmental issues which would not be resolved through standard design and operating practice. The project scope must include extraordinary or non-routine conditions and examples to be resolved, as documented by a planning study such as: Campus Master or Precinct/College Plan, Facility Condition Assessment, and Pre-Design/Feasibility.	
Yes or No	ACADEMIC PROGRAM AND ENROLLMENT GROWTH: The institution has identified demonstrated space shortages related to Board of Regents approved academic program creation or expansion with the following: 5-year enrollment trends responding to strategic or programmatic needs and a targeted space utilization analysis showing use consistently beyond UWSA standards, and/or evidence that enrollment exceeds original building design capacity. The project documentation will must be accompanied by market studies as appropriate and operational impact reports, historical enrollment data, and sound financial plans.	
Yes or No	REVENUE-BASED INITIATIVES: The institution has identified and demonstrated space shortages related to the need of additional residence hall beds, dining capacity, parking, or other student- supported and engagement space , and/or community-based initiatives. Project documentation must include market studies as appropriate and financial analysis, debt service payment schedules, and sound business plans.	
Yes or No	EFFECTIVE USE OF CAPITAL AND OPERATING RESOURCES: The institution has identified and demonstrated that the existing facilities are insufficient, dysfunctional, and no longer cost effective to operate and maintain. The project documentation provides a Building Condition Assessment demonstrating poor adaptive reuse potential for its intended purpose and a cost to upgrade, renovate and repair that exceeds 75% of replacement cost.	

PART II: These evaluation criteria apply to all Major Project requests, regardless of funding source(s). The categories and criteria were established by determining distinguishing factors of project requests. Some criteria are entirely objective; either the project request meets the criteria definition or it doesn't. Other criteria are subjective; the criteria definition is partially met or the degree to which the criteria definition is met is open to interpretation. Only those projects ranked each biennium will be used to gauge the range of possible points given for the subjective criteria; there are no absolute standards for maximum points awarded. Subjective points will be an assigned consensus value by the group of evaluators. If all the capital project prerequisites are satisfied, then the project request will continue through the remaining evaluation criteria and process.

SCORING	CAPITAL PROJECT PREREQUISITES	5 Requirements
Yes or No	NET NEW SQUARE FOOTAGE: If the proposed project includes new assignable square footage, the institution has met the net new square footage prerequisite.	
Yes or No	EVIDENCE OF PLANNING: The institution has demonstrated and documented previous indication(s) and intent(s) for the majority of project scope through one or more of the following items: Campus Master or Capital Plan, Facility Condition Assessment, Feasibility Study, Project Priority and Sequence Chart, Pre-Design, Space Use Study.	
Yes or No	INSTITUTIONAL READINESS: The institution has demonstrated and documented its ability and capacity to execute and manage the proposed project within the context of the proposed six-year institutional capital plan and in or by the proposed biennium through the following items: (a) Qualified institutional project team members identified and assigned fully documented and submitted six-year institutional capital plan ; (b) S surge space identified and reallocated or reserved as necessary ; and (c) appropriate and adequate operational resources identified and documented to operate and maintain the resulting capital asset(s) .	
Yes or No	INFRASTRUCTURE IMPACT: The institution has identified and requested, if necessary, the required additional site infrastructure/utility funding commitments and/or those have been included in the Capital Plan in the biennium prior to, and/or in the same biennium as the project.	
Yes or No	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT:—The institution has identified and documented appropriate operational funding resources and staffing to operate and maintain the resulting capital asset(s).	

**THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS EVALUATION CRITERIA (REVISIONS)**

PART III

SCORING	INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITY	20 Points
0 or 10 pts	#1 HIGHEST RANK FOR CURRENT BIENNIUM: The institution ranked the project as its highest priority Major Project Request for the current biennium within the context of the proposed six-year institutional capital plan.	
0 or 5 pts	#1 HIGHEST RANK FOR ONE (1) PLAST BIENNIUM: The institution ranked the project as its highest priority Major Project Request for one p last biennium within the context of the proposed six-year institutional capital plan.	
0 or 3 pts	#1 HIGHEST RANK FOR THE TWO (2) PLAST TWO BIENNIA: The institution ranked the project as its highest priority Major Project Request for the wo p last two biennia within the context of the proposed six-year institutional capital plan.	
0 or 2 pts	PROJECT SEQUENCE: Project must be completed prior to other projects identified in the proposed six-year institutional capital plan.	

SCORING	PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS	40 Points
0 - 5 pts	CODES, STANDARDS, HEALTH & SAFETY: Project resolves demonstrated and documented building codes and/or standards compliance issues and/or health, safety, and environmental issues that would not be resolved through standard design practice and appropriate design standards. The project scope must include extraordinary or non-routine conditions and examples that need resolution.	
0 - 10 pts	DEMOLITION: Project eliminates demonstrated and documented capital maintenance or avoids anticipated future capital maintenance through demolition of space that is deteriorated, obsolete, and/or has no viable reuse.	
0 - 15 pts	CAPITAL RENEWAL: Project renews demonstrated and documented capital maintenance and/or anticipated future capital maintenance through renovation. Project scopes including only remodeled/renovated space receive full credit. Project scopes including new ancillary spaces and/or non-assignable spaces (elevators, mechanical rooms, restrooms, etc.) are not penalized. Project scopes including remodeled/renovated space + new assignable space receive partial credit. Partial credit scoring will be based on cost (\$) ratio of remodeled/renovated space to new space included in the project.	
0 - 10 pts	FACILITY REUSE: Existing space is adequate and appropriate for renovation; no new assignable space required. Project scopes including only remodeled/renovated space receive full credit. Project scopes including new ancillary spaces and/or non-assignable spaces (elevators, mechanical rooms, restrooms, etc.) are not penalized. Project scopes including remodeled/renovated space + new assignable space receive partial credit. Partial credit scoring will be based on space (GSF) ratio of remodeled/renovated space to new space included in the project.	

SCORING	PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS	40 Points
0 - 15 pts	FUNCTIONALITY: Project provides new/improved program space functionality through configuration, relocation, or technology. The project scope includes one or more of the following items for new/improved functionality: (a) area(s)/technology specifically designed/implemented and/or (b) remodeled/renovated/relocated.	
0 - 5 pts	OPERATIONAL IMPACT: Project improves operational efficiencies through consolidation, reorganization, and/or relocation and supports sustainability. The project scope includes one or more of the following items to improve operational efficiency: (a) area program space(s) and/or technology specifically designed and/or implemented, and/or (b) remodeling/renovation/relocation with (1) demonstrated operational budget reductions and/or projections as a result of completing this project and/or (2) demonstrated resource reallocation to accommodate any new net square footage constructed.	
0 - 15 pts	SPACE NEED: Project targets and resolves demonstrated space shortages. The project scope includes one or more of the following items to meet demonstrated space shortages: (a) area program space(s)/technology specifically designed/implemented and/or (b) remodeling/renovation/relocation; and the space need must be documented in the capital planning support documentation (i.e. the Space Needs Summary document or an appropriate space needs analysis report).	
0 - 5 pts	SPACE UTILIZATION: Project demonstrates improved space utilization for scheduled program space and/or makes use of underutilized space. The project scope includes one or more of the following items to improve space utilization: (a) area program space(s) specifically designed to replace underutilized assigned/surplus space with assigned space and/or (b) remodeling/renovation/relocation.	

**THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS EVALUATION CRITERIA**

PART I: These evaluation criteria apply to all requests for new assignable* square footage, regardless of funding source(s). Project requests seeking to add additional assignable square footage **must meet at least one of the following four criteria** to advance further for capital budget consideration. If the net new square footage‡ prerequisite is satisfied, then the project request will continue through the remaining evaluation criteria and process. Each institution must provide demonstrated proof that no other appropriate facilities are available to accommodate the proposed expansion needs.

* Assignable square footage does not include any circulation; restrooms; mechanical or electrical rooms; structural areas; or building service areas.

‡ Net new square footage does not include replace-in-kind, even if the replacement space is larger than the original space due to current construction and facility standards and practices. This only applies to new square footage purely for program creation or expansion purposes.

SCORING	NET NEW SQUARE FOOTAGE PREREQUISITE	4 Criteria
Yes or No	FACILITY STANDARDS AND COMPLIANCE: The institution has demonstrated and documented building codes and/or standards compliance issues and/or health, safety, and environmental issues would not be resolved through standard design and operating practice. The project scope must include extraordinary or non-routine conditions and examples to be resolved, as documented by a planning study such as: Campus Master or Precinct/College Plan, Facility Condition Assessment, and Pre-Design/Feasibility.	
Yes or No	ACADEMIC PROGRAM AND ENROLLMENT GROWTH: The institution has identified demonstrated space shortages related to Board of Regents approved academic program creation or expansion with the following: 5-year enrollment trends responding to strategic or programmatic needs and a targeted space utilization analysis showing use consistently beyond UWSA standards, and/or evidence that enrollment exceeds original building design capacity. The project documentation must be accompanied by market studies as appropriate and operational impact reports, historical enrollment data, and sound financial plans.	
Yes or No	REVENUE-BASED INITIATIVES: The institution has identified and demonstrated space shortages related to the need of additional residence hall beds, dining capacity, parking, or other student- supported and engagement space, and/or community-based initiatives. Project documentation must include market studies as appropriate and financial analysis, debt service payment schedules, and sound business plans.	
Yes or No	EFFECTIVE USE OF CAPITAL AND OPERATING RESOURCES: The institution has identified and demonstrated that the existing facilities are insufficient, dysfunctional, and no longer cost effective to operate and maintain. The project documentation provides a Building Condition Assessment demonstrating poor adaptive reuse potential for its intended purpose and a cost to upgrade, renovate and repair that exceeds 75% of replacement cost.	

PART II: These evaluation criteria apply to all Major Project requests, regardless of funding source(s). The categories and criteria were established by determining distinguishing factors of project requests. Some criteria are entirely objective; either the project request meets the criteria definition or it doesn't. Other criteria are subjective; the criteria definition is partially met or the degree to which the criteria definition is met is open to interpretation. Only those projects ranked each biennium will be used to gauge the range of possible points given for the subjective criteria; there are no absolute standards for maximum points awarded. Subjective points will be an assigned consensus value by the group of evaluators. If all the capital project prerequisites are satisfied, then the project request will continue through the remaining evaluation criteria and process.

SCORING	CAPITAL PROJECT PREREQUISITES	5 Requirements
Yes or No	NET NEW SQUARE FOOTAGE: If the proposed project includes new assignable square footage, the institution has met the net new square footage prerequisite.	
Yes or No	EVIDENCE OF PLANNING: The institution has demonstrated and documented previous indication(s) and intent(s) for the majority of project scope through one or more of the following items: Campus Master or Capital Plan, Facility Condition Assessment, Feasibility Study, Project Priority and Sequence Chart, Pre-Design, Space Use Study.	
Yes or No	INSTITUTIONAL READINESS: The institution has demonstrated and documented its ability and capacity to execute and manage the proposed project within the context of the proposed six-year institutional capital plan and in or by the proposed biennium through the following items: (a) fully documented and submitted six-year institutional capital plan; (b) surge space identified and reallocated or reserved as necessary; and (c) appropriate and adequate operational resources identified and documented to operate and maintain the resulting capital asset(s).	
Yes or No	INFRASTRUCTURE IMPACT: The institution has identified and requested, if necessary, the required additional site infrastructure/utility funding commitments and/or those have been included in the Capital Plan in the biennium prior to, and/or in the same biennium as the project.	

**THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM
MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS EVALUATION CRITERIA**

PART III

SCORING	INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITY	20 Points
0 or 10 pts	HIGHEST RANK FOR CURRENT BIENNIUM: The institution ranked the project as its highest priority Major Project Request for the current biennium within the context of the proposed six-year institutional capital plan.	
0 or 5 pts	HIGHEST RANK FOR LAST BIENNIUM: The institution ranked the project as its highest priority Major Project Request for last biennium within the context of the proposed six-year institutional capital plan.	
0 or 3 pts	HIGHEST RANK FOR THE LAST TWO BIENNIA: The institution ranked the project as its highest priority Major Project Request for the last two biennia within the context of the proposed six-year institutional capital plan.	
0 or 2 pts	PROJECT SEQUENCE: Project must be completed prior to other projects identified in the proposed six-year institutional capital plan.	

SCORING	PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS	40 Points
0 - 5 pts	CODES, STANDARDS, HEALTH & SAFETY: Project resolves demonstrated and documented building codes and/or standards compliance issues and/or health, safety, and environmental issues that would not be resolved through standard design practice and appropriate design standards. The project scope must include extraordinary or non-routine conditions and examples that need resolution.	
0 - 10 pts	DEMOLITION: Project eliminates demonstrated and documented capital maintenance or avoids anticipated future capital maintenance through demolition of space that is deteriorated, obsolete, and/or has no viable reuse.	
0 - 15 pts	CAPITAL RENEWAL: Project renews demonstrated and documented capital maintenance and/or anticipated future capital maintenance through renovation. Project scopes including only remodeled/renovated space receive full credit. Project scopes including new ancillary spaces and/or non-assignable spaces (elevators, mechanical rooms, restrooms, etc.) are not penalized. Project scopes including remodeled/renovated space + new assignable space receive partial credit. Partial credit scoring will be based on cost (\$) ratio of remodeled/renovated space to new space included in the project.	
0 - 10 pts	FACILITY REUSE: Existing space is adequate and appropriate for renovation; no new assignable space required. Project scopes including only remodeled/renovated space receive full credit. Project scopes including new ancillary spaces and/or non-assignable spaces (elevators, mechanical rooms, restrooms, etc.) are not penalized. Project scopes including remodeled/renovated space + new assignable space receive partial credit. Partial credit scoring will be based on space (GSF) ratio of remodeled/renovated space to new space included in the project.	

SCORING	PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS	40 Points
0 - 15 pts	FUNCTIONALITY: Project provides new/improved program space functionality through configuration, relocation, or technology. The project scope includes one or more of the following items for new/improved functionality: (a) area(s)/technology specifically designed/implemented and/or (b) remodeled/renovated/relocated.	
0 - 5 pts	OPERATIONAL IMPACT: Project improves operational efficiencies through consolidation, reorganization, and/or relocation and supports sustainability. The project scope includes one or more of the following items to improve operational efficiency: (a) program space(s) and/or technology specifically designed and/or implemented, and/or (b) remodeling/renovation/relocation with (1) demonstrated operational budget reductions and/or projections as a result of completing this project and/or (2) demonstrated resource reallocation to accommodate any new net square footage constructed.	
0 - 15 pts	SPACE NEED: Project targets and resolves demonstrated space shortages. The project scope includes one or more of the following items to meet demonstrated space shortages: (a) program space(s)/technology specifically designed/implemented and/or (b) remodeling/renovation/relocation.	
0 - 5 pts	SPACE UTILIZATION: Project demonstrates improved space utilization for scheduled program space and/or makes use of underutilized space. The project scope includes one or more of the following items to improve space utilization: (a) program space(s) specifically designed to replace underutilized assigned/surplus space with assigned space and/or (b) remodeling/renovation/relocation.	