

California Community Colleges

New Criteria for Prioritizing Capital Outlay Projects Used for 2002-03 New Start Projects

Introduction

Recent history has shown there are insufficient state resources to pay for all of the community college facilities needs in California. Therefore, to continue to provide access to a quality education for the state's community college students, the following priority criteria have been developed to guide the investment of limited state capital outlay funds into eligible projects.

General Criteria

1. Capital outlay projects are annually prioritized based on criteria set by the Board of Governors. Projects are approved in these phases:
 - Acquisition (a)
 - Preliminary Plans (p)
 - Working Drawings (w)
 - Construction (c)
 - Equipment (e)

1. Only after it has been determined by the district and the Chancellor's Office that there is no viable alternative to constructing or reconstructing a facility will a proposed project be considered for scope approval and state funding.

2. Completion of previously state-funded projects will have the highest priority for funding in each category. Projects within Category A and D will be prioritized in the subcategory order shown. Projects within Categories B through F will be prioritized on a basis of least cost to state community college facilities related funds. (Technical enhancements to this basis to ensure equitable competition among projects will be further defined in consultation with the ACBO Facilities Task Force.) Collaborative partnerships may enhance a project's eligibility if the collaboration reduces a project's state cost. Additional selection criteria also exist in Categories B, D & E.

3. State funding for all equipment projects will be consistent with the Group II equipment guidelines. Requests for instructional equipment for an

education building or education center that is constructed through a public-private partnership or that is acquired without state funding can compete for funding in Categories B through F after the project scope has received Board of Governors approval through the normal submittal process.

4. Current state regulations restrict the use of state capital outlay funds for student centers, stadia, dorms, parking lots, and single-purpose auditoriums (Title 5, *California Code of Regulations*, Section 57001.5 (d)).
5. The Board shall propose for funding no more than one scope-approved "new-start" project per authorized site in any given fiscal year.
6. The Board of Governors may make exceptions to these criteria and funding percentages when it determines that to do so will benefit the community college system.

Specific Criteria

Category A - To provide for safe facilities and activate existing space.

(No more than 50% of funds available in any given year)

To provide for existing safe facilities/infrastructure and to equip previously, state-funded construction projects.

- A-1 Imminent danger to the life or safety of the building occupants -- with adequate documentation from a qualified independent third party (least cost/no growth)
- A-2 Equipment to complete previously state-funded construction projects
- A-3 Seismic Deficiencies -- potential seismic risk (least cost/no growth)
- A-4 Immediate infrastructure failure (least cost/no growth)

Category B - To increase instructional capacity.

(Up to 50% of funds available in any given year after funding Category A projects)

To provide for reconstruction of existing space, construction of new space, and purchase of equipment to meet existing enrollment and provide for increased instructional capacity in classrooms, laboratories, libraries/learning resource centers and instructional audio and visual services (including land acquisition costs and site development when necessary to site facilities). Only projects at

or below 100% capacity-to-load ratio upon project completion initially qualify for funding within this category. Completion of previously-funded Category B projects will have the highest priority for funding in this category.

- Reconstruction of existing space
- Construction of new space

Category C - To modernize instructional space.

(Up to 25% of funds available in any given year after funding Category A projects)

To provide for reconstruction or replacement of existing space and purchase of equipment to improve instructional programs and/or service delivery in classrooms, laboratories, libraries/ learning resource centers and instructional audio and visual services. Projects in this category increase instructional efficiency and/or enhance instructional delivery systems through changes in teaching methods, improved technology and other infrastructure changes. However, projects in this category will not cause or increase the overbuilt status of a site, and do not utilize capacity-to-load ratios to determine project eligibility. Completion of previously funded Category C projects will have the highest priority for funding in this category.

- Reconstruction of existing space
- Replacement of existing space

Category D - To promote a complete campus concept.

(Up to 15% of funds available in any given year after funding Category A projects; funds may be shared with Categories E and F, as necessary, to fully fund a project)

To provide for reconstruction of existing space, construction of new space and purchase of equipment to promote a complete campus concept. Projects that introduce never before available basic services to complete a campus are given preference for funding over projects that replace or add to an existing facility of similar use. Completion of previously funded Category D projects will have the highest priority for funding in this category.

- D-1 Physical education, performing arts, child development facilities, and other capital projects which promote a complete campus
- D-2 Cafeterias, maintenance shops, warehouses and capital energy projects

Category E - To increase institutional support services capacity.

(Up to 5% of funds available in any given year after funding Category A projects;

funds may be shared with Categories D and F, as necessary, to fully fund a project)

To provide for reconstruction of existing space, construction of new space and purchase of equipment to meet existing need and provide for increased capacity for administrative, instructional, student and other support services (including land acquisition and site development costs when necessary to site facilities). Only projects at or below 100% capacity-to-load ratio upon project completion initially qualify for funding within this category. Completion of previously funded Category E projects will have the highest priority for funding in this category.

- Reconstruction of existing space
- Construction of new space

Category F - To modernize institutional support services space.

(Up to 5% of funds available in any given year after funding Category A projects; funds may be shared with Categories D and E, as necessary, to fully fund a project)

To provide for reconstruction or replacement of existing space and purchase of equipment to improve program and/or service delivery in administrative, instructional, student and other support services. Projects in this category increase administrative and support services efficiency and/or delivery systems. However, projects in this category will not cause or increase the overbuilt status of a site, and do not utilize capacity-to-load ratios to determine project eligibility. Completion of previously-funded Category F projects will have the highest priority for funding in this category.

- Reconstruction of existing space
- Replacement of existing space

Review Scope and Cost of Each Potential New Start Project

Consistent with the previous project ranking system, the new Board of Governor's system for ranking capital outlay proposals requires that Chancellor's Office staff understand the cost and scope of each proposal and determine if it advocates a scope of work supportable by the Board of Governors. All requests for state capital outlay funds should be for facilities or equipment supportable by the state and, in total, funded at levels consistent with the California Community College 1995-96 Building Unit Cost Guidelines indexed to the funding fiscal year under consideration.

Board policies support most facilities on community college campuses, but do not support capital outlay proposals for parking structures, bookstores, stadiums and dormitories and other structure capable of generating revenue. Such structures are considered capable of funding their own capital improvements or expansions. Also, policies do not support the construction of facilities that would create or perpetuate the overbuilt status of a particular site unless such overbuilt status is temporary in nature and would be eliminated in the short term by the completion of projects then under development or construction. This transitional status would need to be justified by a district facility master plan. A site is considered overbuilt if either its initial capacity load ratio or ending capacity load ratio exceed 100%. The initial capacity load ratio is defined as the space inventory capacity divided by the enrollment load at the point in time when the requested project would begin. For example, proposals now under review would begin in fiscal year 2003-04. The ending capacity load ratio is defined as the space inventory capacity divided the enrollment load in the fiscal year the project is completed and posted to the space inventory.

General State Priorities

In all categories, the objective of the Board of Governor's capital outlay spending plan is to complete previously started projects before starting new projects. The Board gives preference to projects that provide for safe facilities and activate existing space (Category A projects). Category A projects include the following subcategories

- A-1, Projects that address imminent dangers to the life or safety of building occupants. Each proposed solution is to be the least cost permanent solution and provides for no change in program function and no increase in site capacity.
- A-2, Projects that provide equipment funding to complete previously state-funded construction projects. State-funded projects are to be equipped to the extent there is expansion space created for existing programs or space is created that enable the site to offer a new program.

- A-3, Projects that address seismic deficiencies or potential seismic risk in existing buildings. Each proposed solution is to be the least cost permanent solution and provides for no change in program function and no increase in site capacity
- A-4, Projects that address the repair or replacement of infrastructure in existing buildings or on existing sites that is subject to immediate failure. Each proposed solution is to be the least cost permanent solution and provides for no change in program function and no increase in site capacity.

One recent change in Board policy is that no more than 50% of the total available state capital outlay funds would be dedicated to support Category A proposals. After all category A projects are addressed or once the 50% limitation is reached, the remaining funds would be dedicated to accomplish projects in the remaining five categories:

- Category B - To increase instructional capacity.
- Category C - To modernize instructional space.
- Category D - To promote a complete campus concept.
- Category E - To increase institutional support services capacity.
- Category F - To modernize institutional support services space.

Definition of Category B and E Projects

Projects may involve new construction, replacement construction, building alterations, and demolition or a combination of these four scopes of work. Projects are categorized as B or E projects if they increase site capacity. Projects usually seek to create more outside gross square footage (OGSF) and more assignable square footage (ASF) on a site to accomplish this objective. Most new construction projects are designed to add both OGSF and ASF at a site and thereby increase site capacity. Adding space to an existing building as an alteration or building a larger replacement building also adds space to a site, but may not change a site's capacity. For example, if current building codes allow fewer students at each fumehood (workstation), a project may need to expand space just to add additional workstations to comply with current codes. We would not consider a project with such an expansion of space a category B or E project as it does not have an increase in site capacity. However, replacement construction and building alteration projects that increase total ASF beyond the demands of building code requirements are deemed to increase site capacity.

In contrast, some proposals may advocate the creation of more capacity at a site and are not be considered category B or E projects. A building alteration project that increases efficiency within a building may in fact increase site capacity without changing the OGSF in the building. Such a project may be

considered a Category A-1, A-3, A-4, C or F project depending on the circumstances.

Basic Concept –Category B and E (projects that increase capacity)

Board of Governor’s capital outlay spending plans using the new priority system are to be designed so that Category B projects receive 50% of the funds remaining after addressing Category A projects. Category E projects receive 5% of the remaining funds. Preference for funds in these categories is first given to continuing projects with the highest eligibility points. If any funds remain in category B or E after funding the continuing projects, then it may be possible to fund “new start” projects in the category.

New start projects with scopes of work approved by the Board of Governors’ and with the highest eligibility points get the first opportunity to receive state funds. The following four factors (weighted equally) generate eligibility points for projects in these two categories. Each factor is capable of generating 50 eligibility points or potentially 200 points for each project. The following table illustrates the eligibility point concept for projects that increase site capacity:

- Enrollment Growth
- Existing Inventory
- Assignable Square Footage (ASF) Change
- Local Contribution

Table 1
Listing of Sample Projects
Eligibility Point Calculation

Project	Enrollment Growth	Existing Inventory	ASF Change	Local Contribution	Total Points
Maximum	50	50	50	50	200
A	37	20	42	14	113
B	31	5	26	50	112
C	36	11	50	0	97
D	50	2	39	0	91
E	13	36	42	0	91
F	13	9	45	0	67
G	24	5	17	0	46
H	30	0	6	0	36

Enrollment Growth Factor – Table 2

Growth in enrollment volume (in Weekly Student Contact Hours) at a site over a five-year period demonstrates the need for additional instructional or institutional support space. The difference in WSCH volume for all community college locations between academic years 1999-00 and 2004-05 were used to establish the values in Table 2. Locations with the largest volume of

enrollment growth between the last actual data year and the fourth projected data year are to be given preference with this factor. Sites with extraordinary growth rates, but relatively smaller total WSCH volumes also may need additional facilities and may earn additional enrollment growth eligibility points.

Each year the five-year construction plan for each approved college or educational center is analyzed to determine the difference in WSCH volume between the last actual year and the fourth projected year. That volume of WSCH is compared to the values in Table 2 and determines the amount of enrollment growth eligibility points each project receives. To recognize extraordinary growth rates, the net change in WSCH is divided by the beginning WSCH to calculate a growth rate percentage. If the result is greater than 10% add 5 points to the table amount, if greater than 15% add 10 points, and if greater than 20% add 15 points.

Existing Inventory Factor-Category B Projects - Table 3A

The ratio of inventory space capacity divided by actual enrollment load in the year when the project is scheduled to begin (initial capacity load ratio) may show an immediate need for additional instructional space in the categories of lecture, laboratory, library or AVTV. Initial capacity load ratios existing in 1999 from all four of the instructional space types from all community college locations were used to determine the values in Table 3A. Locations with the lowest initial capacity load ratios in the instructional areas are given preference with this factor.

Each year, the five-year construction plan for each approved college or educational center is analyzed to determine the initial capacity load ratios. The scope of each proposal is reviewed to determine the dominant instructional space type being created by the project. The initial capacity load ratio of the dominant space type is identified in conjunction with the values in table 3A to determine the eligibility points. For example if library space is the dominant space type in a project and the initial capacity load ratio for library is 75%, the project would received in the existing inventory factor the number of eligibility points that correspond to 75%. (If the dominant space type being created by the project is office, table 3B is used to calculate the eligibility points).

Existing Inventory Factor-Category E Projects – Table 3B

The ratio of existing inventory of office space capacity divided by actual headcount of full time equivalent values for certificated staff may show an immediate need for additional institutional support (office) space. Initial capacity load ratios for office space in 1999 at all community college locations

were used to determine the values in Table 3B. Locations with the lowest initial capacity load ratios in office are given preference with this factor.

Each year, the five-year construction plan for each approved college or educational center is analyzed to determine the initial capacity load ratios for office. The scope of each proposal is reviewed to determine if the dominant space type being created by the project is office in which case the eligibility points for the office project is determined by using Table 3B. (If the dominant space type being created by the project is lecture, laboratory, library, or AVTV, Table 3A is used to calculate the eligibility points).

ASF Change Factor - Table 4

A project design that directly addresses the identified need for more instructional or institutional support space generates eligibility points in this factor. The eligibility points for each project were generated by calculating the percentage of project ASF that directly contributes to a site's need for additional space as determined by the initial capacity load ratios. When a project that increases site capacity is providing additional instructional or institutional support space and the initial capacity load ratio for those spaces are less than 100%, the project gets credit for providing needed space.

To encourage the renovation of under-used space or the elimination of unused space in proposals, any net reduction of space in one or more space categories does not offset the impact of the space expansion in other space categories when calculating the ASF Change eligibility points.

Local Contribution Factor – Table 5

A local contribution is facility program financing that directly mitigates the state supportable project cost. Such contribution generates eligibility points to the extent that the local contribution mitigates up to 50% of the state supportable project costs. Local contribution may include district or local funds, federal funds such as FEMA, NASA or other agency grant or loan funds, donations, joint venture arrangements, or other non-state funds. Joint venture projects that assign state capital outlay funds from other California higher education or the K-12 system to partially fund the community college portion of projects, while not reducing the cost to the state, will impact the calculation of local contribution eligibility points in the same manner as a local contribution from non-state sources. Local contributions do not include additional local funds provided to the project because the project costs exceed the amounts allowable by the state building space and cost guidelines. Also, funds dedicated to state local assistance programs such as the Scheduled Maintenance and Special Repairs and Hazardous Substances Removal programs (including the local match component) cannot be considered as part of the local contribution.

In the event that state bond funds require a “district match” to receive funds, the structure and use of the “local contribution factor” to calculate project eligibility for funding will be reconsidered.

Table 2
Enrollment Growth Factor
Eligibility Point Chart
Change in five years of Campus WSCH

5 year change in WSCH				Eligibility Points	5 year change in WSCH				Eligibility Points
	25,615	or greater		50	Between	10,246	and	10,759	20
Between	25,103	and	25,615	49	"	9,734	"	10,246	19
"	24,591	"	25,103	48	"	9,222	"	9,734	18
"	24,079	"	24,591	47	"	8,709	"	9,222	17
"	23,566	"	24,079	46	"	8,197	"	8,709	16
"	23,054	"	23,566	45	"	7,685	"	8,197	15
"	22,542	"	23,054	44	"	7,172	"	7,685	14
"	22,029	"	22,542	43	"	6,660	"	7,172	13
"	21,517	"	22,029	42	"	6,148	"	6,660	12
"	21,005	"	21,517	41	"	5,635	"	6,148	11
"	20,492	"	21,005	40	"	5,123	"	5,635	10
"	19,980	"	20,492	39	"	4,611	"	5,123	9
"	19,468	"	19,980	38	"	4,098	"	4,611	8
"	18,955	"	19,468	37	"	3,586	"	4,098	7
"	18,443	"	18,955	36	"	3,074	"	3,586	6
"	17,931	"	18,443	35	"	2,562	"	3,074	5
"	17,419	"	17,931	34	"	2,049	"	2,562	4
"	16,906	"	17,419	33	"	1,537	"	2,049	3
"	16,394	"	16,906	32	"	1,025	"	1,537	2
"	15,882	"	16,394	31	"	512	"	1,025	1
"	15,369	"	15,882	30	"	0	"	512	0
"	14,857	"	15,369	29	Declines in WSCH				0
"	14,345	"	14,857	28					
"	13,832	"	14,345	27	Bonus eligibility points for extraordinary growth rates				
"	13,320	"	13,832	26					
"	12,808	"	13,320	25	If the net change in WSCH divided by the beginning WSCH calculates to a growth rate of greater than 10% add 5 points to the table amount, if greater than 15% add 10 points, and if greater than 20% add 15 points.				
"	12,295	"	12,808	24					
"	11,783	"	12,295	23					
"	11,271	"	11,783	22					
"	10,759	"	11,271	21					

Table 3A

Existing Inventory Factor – Instructional Areas
 Eligibility Point Chart
Lecture, Laboratory, Library, and AVTV Initial Capacity Load Ratios

Initial Capacity Load Ratio	Eligibility Points		Initial Capacity Load Ratio	Eligibility Points
Greater than 100%	0		63%	25
100%	0		62%	26
99%	1		61%	26
98%	1		60%	27
97%	2		59%	28
96%	3		58%	28
95%	3		57%	29
94%	4		56%	30
93%	5		55%	30
92%	5		54%	31
91%	6		53%	32
90%	7		52%	32
89%	7		51%	33
88%	8		50%	34
87%	9		49%	34
86%	9		48%	35
85%	10		47%	36
84%	11		46%	36
83%	11		45%	37
82%	12		44%	38
81%	13		43%	39
80%	14		42%	39
79%	14		41%	40
78%	15		40%	41
77%	16		39%	41
76%	16		38%	42
75%	17		37%	43
74%	18		36%	43
73%	18		35%	44
72%	19		34%	45
71%	20		33%	45
70%	20		32%	46
69%	21		31%	47
68%	22		30%	47
67%	22		29%	48
66%	23		28%	49
65%	24		27%	49
64%	24		26%	50
			less than 26%	50

Table 3B

Existing Inventory Factor – Institutional Support Areas

Eligibility Point Chart

Office Initial Capacity Load Ratios

Initial Capacity Load Ratio	Eligibility Points		Initial Capacity Load Ratio	Eligibility Points
Greater than 100%	0		64%	25
100%	0		63%	26
99%	1		62%	27
98%	1		61%	27
97%	2		60%	28
96%	3		59%	29
95%	4		58%	30
94%	4		57%	30
93%	5		56%	31
92%	6		55%	32
91%	6		54%	32
90%	7		53%	33
89%	8		52%	34
88%	8		51%	35
87%	9		50%	35
86%	10		49%	36
85%	11		48%	37
84%	11		47%	37
83%	12		46%	38
82%	13		45%	39
81%	13		44%	39
80%	14		43%	40
79%	15		42%	41
78%	15		41%	42
77%	16		40%	42
76%	17		39%	43
75%	18		38%	44
74%	18		37%	44
73%	19		36%	45
72%	20		35%	46
71%	20		34%	46
70%	21		33%	47
69%	22		32%	48
68%	23		31%	49
67%	23		30%	49
66%	24		29%	50
65%	25		less than 29%	50

Table 4

ASF Change Factor
 Eligibility Point Calculation
Project Design Provides Needed Space

Room Type	Net change in ASF in project	Initial capacity load ratio	Calculate ASF that helps with need If % is greater than 100% or if asf is less than zero, use zero. If asf is greater than zero and if % is less than 100%, use asf
Lecture	# asf	%	# asf
Lab	# asf	%	# asf
Office	# asf	%	# asf
Library	# asf	%	# asf
AVTV	# asf	%	# asf
Other	# asf	N/A	0
	Total asf		Total asf that contributes
% of Total project that contributes =			$\frac{\text{Total asf that contributes}}{\text{Total asf}}$
Eligibility points =			$\frac{\% \text{ of asf that contributes}}{2}$

California Community Colleges
 Capital Outlay Proposals Ranking System
 Briefing Paper – Complete Campus Projects

Table 5

Local Contribution Factor

Eligibility Point Calculation

District funds directly mitigate the need for State Financing

	USE of Funds	Percentage
Total Project Cost	\$X,XXX,XXX	
Less :		
Non-State supportable items	\$X,XXX,XXX	
State supportable project cost	\$X,XXX,XXX	<u>100%</u>
Financing Sources		
	Source of Funds	
District funds (excludes state local assistance, if any)	\$X,XXX,XXX	?%
Federal funds	\$X,XXX,XXX	?%
State Capital Outlay (includes required local match, if any)	\$X,XXX,XXX	State %
Other funds	\$X,XXX,XXX	?%
Total Financing (equals state supportable costs)	\$X,XXX,XXX	<u>100%</u>
Eligibility points = (1- state %) X 100		
(If state percentage is less than 50% use 50 points)		

Modernization – Categories C and F

Purpose

The purpose of the modernization categories, C and F, is to: 1) increase instructional efficiency and/or enhance instructional delivery systems (Category C); or 2) improve program and/or service delivery in administrative, instructional, student and other support services (Category F), through changes in teaching/delivery methods, improved technology and other infrastructure changes, to be achieved by alterations to the facility's space and infrastructure.

These categories are designed to optimize existing space. The categories target those spaces/campuses needing program space alterations that may not necessarily have the enrollment growth to support such changes. The long-term goal of modernization is to bring outdated or underutilized community college facilities to an acceptable level of program and facilities performance to ensure student success.

The focus of modernization projects is to improve program capability, expansion of programs/services or to eliminate substandard/portables/relocatable spaces. These categories are not to be used to update or upgrade building infrastructure without programmatic benefits.

California Community Colleges
Capital Outlay Proposals Ranking System
Briefing Paper – Complete Campus Projects

General Guidelines and Definitions

Building Codes: to help avoid delays, the Chancellor’s Office strongly suggests DSA consultation during design documents development to ensure the necessary building codes requirements are included in the initial design (FPP), particularly for access compliance.

Building Cost Guidelines: costs for both construction and reconstruction shall average 70% but cannot exceed 100% of new building cost guidelines.

Facilities Condition Analysis and Facilities Condition Index:

Facilities Condition Analysis (FCA) –provides accurately derived estimates of annual facilities renewal costs and defines the current size of the work backlog. It also provides a tool for periodical updates of facility funding requirements and establishes realistic funding benchmarks for annual project funding.

Facilities Condition Index (FCI) – the index establishes a numerical value for the condition of each building. after a FCA has been performed, this index is derived by the following formula:
$$\frac{\text{Cost to Repair the Building}}{\text{Replacement Cost of Building}}$$

Group II equipment (Category A2): Group II equipment funding may be allowable for 1) expanded physical space (asf) for existing programs, or 2) new program space. “New program space “, for this purpose, is defined as asf for a new program that has not been previously offered at the site and has been approved by the State Chancellor’s Office educational services and economic development division.

Group II Equipment Only proposals (for categories eligible for Group II equipment funding): requests for which the district is asking for state funding for the Group II equipment phase of the project only.

These proposals may be eligible if the district has altered the space with funds other than state capital outlay, and the equipment is necessary to activate that space. A modernization project must have been otherwise approvable for state funding. Group II Equipment allowances shall be applied per Chancellor’s Office policy (above).

Immediate infrastructure failure: system does not function as originally designed (example: regulatory agencies [fire dept, OSHA] threaten to close facility for use [code issues]).

California Community Colleges
Capital Outlay Proposals Ranking System
Briefing Paper – Complete Campus Projects

Infrastructure: for the purpose of modernization proposals, applies to:

- building infrastructure – building systems within the facility, including structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and technology that are necessary to support the program space changes and/or for code compliance;
- infrastructure, including technology, outside of the building that directly supports the building only and/or for code compliance (from building to point of connection); and
- modernization categories shall not be used for the repair, replacement, upgrade or expansion of any campus-wide infrastructure system that is not identified with a benefit or improvement to specific buildings.

Institutional support services space includes:

- student support services: i.e., counseling, EOPS, DSP&S, Financial Aid;
- Administrative support services: i.e., MIS, Administration, Facilities, Research, Print Shop
- Other support services: i.e., faculty lounge

Local contribution: may include district funds including federal funds, FEMA grants, local/district funds, foundation, joint-venture, and other non-state funds. Scheduled Maintenance and Special Repairs, Hazardous Materials grants, Instructional Equipment Funds funding (including local match) cannot be considered as part of the local contribution.

Outside gross square footage (ogsf): generally, replacement space and modernization proposals should not include an increase in ogsf; however, an increase in ogsf is permissible if the increase is demanded to comply with building codes. These increases cannot increase the number of stations/offices for the impacted space. If an increase in ogsf results in the growth of capacity, the proposal shall be considered as a Category B or E proposal.

Overbuilt space/site: overbuilt status determined by capacity/load ratios and/or district analysis

Physical education, child development facilities, performing art facilities, and other facilities that promote the complete campus concept:

Category D – to promote a complete campus concept provides for a permanent initial facility or expansion to existing facilities.

See Category D discussion (separate document)

California Community Colleges
Capital Outlay Proposals Ranking System
Briefing Paper – Complete Campus Projects

Program capability: one or more of the following components DETERMINES program capability:

- capacity (stations, asf);
- delivery methodology (smart podiums, virtual labs, consolidating scattered services, improved program accessibility); and
- new course offerings (new program not previously offered on campus that leads to a certificate or degree, program expansion of occupations/careers that are in high demand)

Program function: change in room type and/or TOPS category.

Replacement Space: this option, for modernization proposals, must clearly demonstrate that the alternatives of modernizing existing space are 1) not cost effective and/or 2) that the program capability cannot be improved.

Scope: for modernization proposals, the proposed scope shall focus on enhanced and improved program design and instructional/institutional support services capability. Infrastructure and technology changes shall demonstrate a clear connection to the space alteration or is required to comply with building codes due to the project's alterations.

Secondary Effects: secondary effects are not to be included with primary project proposals. Example: primary proposal consolidates scattered student service offices into a vacant library. The alteration of the scattered student service offices is considered as secondary effects. Secondary effects should be discussed in the primary project proposal but is not a part of the scope.

Substandard Space: space that cannot be reasonably altered to meet the physical needs of the program.

Technology: this scope can include internal building components such as cabling, connections, communication lines, routers, and servers, and external building components such as microwave dishes and towers.

California Community Colleges
 Capital Outlay Proposals Ranking System
 Briefing Paper – Complete Campus Projects

FUNDING CRITERIA	POINTS
I. Building Status	
A. Facilities Condition Index (FCI) <i>(Age of Building shall be used until FCI is available)</i> ✓ 0 points earned for buildings under 5 years old ✓ 2 points earned for each year thereafter with a maximum of 120 points	0 to 120
B. Activates unused space \geq 5% of project asf <i>Space must be inventoried as 050 space.</i> ✓ if criterion met, 30 points earned ✓ if criterion not met, 0 points earned	0 or 30
II. Project Cost <i>% of local contributions that directly mitigate state-supportable project costs</i> ✓ 1 point earned per 1% local contribution with a maximum of 50 points	0 to 50
Total Points Possible	0 to 200

California Community Colleges
Capital Outlay Proposals Ranking System
Briefing Paper – Complete Campus Projects

BACKGROUND/HISTORY:

Category D (formally known as Category C) was created to implement the BOG policy by providing a mechanism for campuses to fund projects that do not fit the criteria in the other BOG categories and are an integral part of a campus activities. Additionally, the BOG policy encourages the elimination of temporary facilities in conjunction with the construction of any new permanent facility. An accumulation of unmet needs and changes in campus priorities has outpaced the ability to objectively prioritize these divergent types of projects within this category without additional refinement to the criteria. When the category was redefined to fit the New Criteria for Prioritizing Capital Outlay Projects some types of projects were omitted, consequently the BOG item may need to be revised. Regardless, technical adjustments are presented in this briefing paper to articulate an objective means of allocating funds to the highest priority project while maintaining system equity.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS' DEFINITION:

Category D - To promote a complete campus concept. *(Up to 15% of funds available in any given year after funding Category A projects; funds may be shared with Categories E & F as necessary to fully fund a project.)*

To provide for reconstruction of existing space, construction of new space and purchase of equipment to promote a complete campus concept. Projects that introduce never before available basic services to complete a campus are given preference for funding over projects that replace or add to an existing facility of similar use. Completion of previously funded Category D projects will have the highest priority for funding in this category.

- D-1 Physical education, performing arts, child development facilities, and other capital projects which promote a complete campus.
- D-2 Cafeterias, maintenance shops, warehouses and capital energy projects.

PROJECT REVIEW AND PRIORITIZATION PROCESS:

Consistent with the analysis of other capital outlay FPPs, the Chancellor's Office reviews the project intent and scope, budget outline, space inventory, and capital outlay five-year plan for any relevant project information. In some cases, staff may be required to contact the district for additional information or clarification. Once staff has determined that the project is within scope and cost guidelines, priority points are given in the four categories listed below:

CATEGORY TYPE	POINTS AVAILABLE
Age of Site	50
Program/Services	50

California Community Colleges
 Capital Outlay Proposals Ranking System
 Briefing Paper – Complete Campus Projects

Project Design	50
Project Cost	50
Total Points Possible	200

Projects are then ranked amongst all other Category D projects. The project with the most accumulated points will achieve the highest priority for funding within this category.

Age of College/Center Site (first year of classes)* – (max 50 points)

- 1 point for each year in excess of 10 years of age (from date of receipt of FPP) with a maximum of 50 points

* As defined in Community College League Directory for “grandfathered” sites or by BOG approval date for new center sites.

Intent: The purpose of this category is to (1) further prior BOG criteria ranking “by the date the college was established,” and (2) give weight to the older campus need to evolve into a “full service” community institution.

Program/Service Offerings (before/after) – (max 50 points)

- Facility needed to bring initial course offerings on campus (max 20 points)
- Facility needed for a degree or certificate (max 20 points)
- Infrastructure needed to meet code, existing enrollment demands or facilitate projected enrollment potential (max 10 points)

Intent: This category is intended to bring courses currently being offered in off-site leased facilities on-site, and to provide incentive for instructionally related facilities necessary for a degree or certificate.

Project Design Solution – (max 50 points)

- Replaces portable/temporary facilities (max 50); or
- Replaces structurally or functionally inadequate facilities (max 30); or
- Expansion/Addition of facilities (max 20)

Intent: This category is designed to eliminate portable and/or temporary facilities and replace them with permanent buildings, it further prioritizes the projects in a manner consistent with prior BOG criteria ranking; “the proposed project does not add or replace an existing facility of similar use on the campus.”

California Community Colleges
Capital Outlay Proposals Ranking System
Briefing Paper – Complete Campus Projects

**Project Cost – percent of local contribution towards supportable project scope
(max 50 points)**

- 1 point earned per 1% of local contribution with a maximum of 50 points

Intent: The purpose of this category is to provide priority to those projects that are joint venture in nature or have local, federal, or other non-community college funds attributed to the approved scope of project, thus enabling the system to fund more projects.