Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Capital Improvement Project Application Formula-Driven Rating Form

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

	District: Project Title:				
	Fund:	Cat	egory:		
_	Date: Ineligible:				
	Formula Driven Scoring Criteria	School Construction A, B, F	Major Maintenance C, D, E		
1.	Preventive maintenance program (Questions 9b - 9d, 9f)A. Detailed summary reports of maintenance labor parameters (9b)15 pointsB. Detailed summary reports of PM/corrective maintenance parameters (9c)10 pointsC. The 5-year average expenditure for maintenance divided by the 5-year average insured replacement value, district wide. (9d)5 pointsIf % < 4, then (% x 1.25); If % > 4, then 55 pointsD. Energy consumption reports (9f)5 points	/15 /10 /5 /5	/15 /10 /5 /5		
2.	District ranking (Question 3a) Only eligible project requests are used to calculate ranking points Project #1 request = 30 points, #2 = 27 points, #3 = 24 points, Each additional project 3 points less	<u>/30</u>	/30		
3.	Weighted average age of facility (Question 3b) A. 0-10 years = 0 points B. > $10 \le 20$ years = $.5 /$ year in excess of 10 years C. > $20 \le 30$ years = $5 + .75$ per year in excess of 20 years D > $30 \le 40$ years = $12.5 + 1.75$ per year in excess of 30 years E. > 40 years = 30 points	<u>/30</u>	<u>/30</u>		
4.	Condition/Component Survey (Question 6a) Condition survey = 0, 3, 5, 8, or 10 points	/10	<u>/10</u>		
5.	Use of Prior Design Plans or Buildings System Design (Questions 6b-6c) A. Prior Design Plan (school construction only) (6b) = 0, 2, 4, 6, 8, or 10 points OR B. District standard = Two points each system: Building Envelope, Plumbing, HVAC, Lighting, Power	<u> </u>	<u>/10</u>		
6.	 Planning & design phase has been completed (Question 6d-6g and Appendix B) A. All required elements of planning = 10 points B. All elements planning + required elements of schematic design = 20 points C. All elements of planning and schematics + required elements of design development = 25 points 	/25	/25		
7.	Prior AS 14.11 funding for this project (Questions 8e & 7a) Phased funding = 30 points, Supplemental funding = 15 points, No previous funding = 0 points	<u>/30</u>	<u> </u>		
8.	Unhoused students today (Questions 5a-5g) A 100 % of capacity = 0 points B. > 100% of capacity = One point for each 3% of excess capacity C. 250 % of capacity = 50 points	<u>/50</u>	<u>N/A</u>		
9.	 Unhoused students in seven years (5 year Post-occupancy) (Questions 5a-5g) Unhoused due to loss of eligible square footage based on external environmental factors is scored at half of the points identified. A 100 % of capacity = 0 points B. > 100% of capacity = One point for each 5% of excess capacity C. 250 % of capacity = 30 points 	<u>/30</u>	<u>N/A</u>		
10	Type of space added or improved (Question 5j)A. Instructional or resource30 pointsB. Support teaching25 pointsC. Food service, recreational, and general support15 pointsD. Supplemental10 points	<u>/30</u>	<u>N/A</u>		
	Formula-Driven Total Points	/280	/170		

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development Capital Improvement Project Application Evaluative Rating Form Formula-Driven Rating Form

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

District:	Project Title:	
Fund:		
Rater:	CIP ID Number:	Category:
Date:	Ineligible:	

Note: Points for elements two through eight will be weighted to apply to each specific category of a mixed-scope project.

Evaluative Scoring Criteria	School Construction A, B, F	Major Maintenance C, D, E
1. Effectiveness of preventive maintenance program (Question 9)		
A. Maintenance Management Narrative (9a)	/5	/5
B. Energy Management Narrative (9e)	/5	/5
C. Custodial Narrative (9g)	/5	/5
D. Maintenance Training Narrative (9h)	/5	/5
E. Capital Planning Narrative (9i)	/5	/5
2. Seriousness of life/safety and code conditions (Question 4a)	/50	<u>/50</u>
3. Reasonableness & completeness of cost or cost estimate (Questions 7a-7c)	/30	/30
 4. Emergency conditions (Question 8a) Did application check "yes"? Did discussion support emergency status? 	/50	/50
5. Existing space fails to meet or inadequately serves existing or proposed elementary or secondary programs (Question 8b)	/40	/5+
6. Thoroughness in considering a full range of options for the project (Question 8c)	<u> </u>	/25
7. Relationship of the project cost to the annual operational cost savings (Question 8d)	/30	/30
8. Thoroughness in considering use of alternative facilities to meet the needs of the project (Question 5g)	/5	<u>N/A</u>
Evaluative Total Points	/255	/215