COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES
Washington State Board

REGULAR (RESOLUTION 25-10-48)

October 16, 2025

Tab 6

Capital Project Prioritization Study Recommendation

Brief Description

State Board staff have worked with college district presidents and vice-presidents through a two-year planning process to develop a framework to permit colleges with projects already included in the major capital pipeline to rescope them to intermediate major capital projects. The goal is to encourage colleges to scale back large, high-cost projects in favor of smaller requests. This shift is intended to streamline the capital pipeline, accelerate the distribution of limited funds, and ensure colleges can reinvest in their facilities to address their most urgent needs sooner than the current pipeline will allow.

How does this item link to the State Board's Strategic Plan?

The facilities built and maintained using funds from the capital budget support the State Board's goals by increasing access to post-secondary education, promoting student achievement and success within a framework of diversity, equity and inclusion.

Background information and analysis

The State Board is responsible for developing a single, prioritized capital request on behalf of the community and technical college system. This process is developed in collaboration with the college system.

Prior to the 2019–21 capital request, to align with anticipated state appropriations, the State Board and system intentionally kept requests modest. This approach helped ensure that projects were typically funded shortly after submission.

By the 2019–21 request, colleges expressed concern that funding was not keeping pace with systemwide needs. That biennium, the State Board developed a request designed to better reflect actual capital demand. As such, any qualifying project that met the minimum scoring threshold was added to the list. A similar approach was taken in 2021–23, when colleges without a project already in the pipeline were invited to submit new proposals. Those that met the threshold were added, expanding the pipeline to more than 40 projects.

The policy established in developing the longer pipeline was that once a college's project is added to the list, it remains there until it receives funding. This policy is intended to give colleges predictability about when to expect major project funding.

There are currently 32 major projects in the pipeline–31 that have gone through the prioritization process, and one added by the State Board due to an urgent need and elevated risk. Of these, seven have been funded through design and still await construction funding. Those are the highest priority

projects in the pipeline.

Given past funding trends, current economic conditions, budget development practices, and projected cost escalation, it could take 15–20 years, or more, to fund all remaining projects. Due to the number of projects already in the pipeline, the State Board has paused soliciting new major projects–except for urgent needs that cannot be deferred, since the 2023–25 request.

Meanwhile, institutional needs continue to change and grow. As such, some projects in the pipeline may no longer represent their college's highest priority. To address this, State Board staff collaborated over the past two years with college presidents and their commissions to develop recommendations aimed at shortening project timelines and aligning funding more closely with current needs.

The study committee included representatives from Washington Association of Community and Technical Colleges (WACTC), Business Affairs, Diversity and Equity Officers, Instruction, and Student Services commissions. The recommendations were grounded in these core principles:

- Maintain system credibility with the Legislature and Governor's Office
- Be transparent and fair to all colleges
- Support priorities in the State Board's strategic plan
- Provide flexibility for colleges to address emergent needs and system priorities

The committee's recommendation is to create a mid-sized project category capped at $15 million and an incentive for colleges to convert existing major projects currently in the pipeline to this new "intermediate" designation. This change allows the project to move up the priority list, in exchange for removing their existing capital project from the pipeline. At their June 2025 meeting, the presidents unanimously approved the framework developed by the study committee.

The framework, procedures, and evaluation criteria for converting major projects to intermediate projects, beginning with the 2027–29 request, are included in Attachment A.

Recommendation/preferred result

Staff recommends approval of Resolution 25-10-49, authorizing implementation of the framework for converting major capital projects in the pipeline to intermediate projects, beginning with the 2027–29 capital request. This includes applying the approved procedures and evaluation criteria, supporting colleges that opt to convert existing projects, and incorporating the revised project mix into the system's prioritized capital request, described in Attachment A.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Darrell Jennings, capital budget director
(360) 704-4382, djennings@sbctc.edu

COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES
Washington State Board

STATE OF WASHINGTON
STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES
RESOLUTION 25-10-48

A resolution relating to incentivizing community and technical colleges to convert major capital projects in the current capital project pipeline to intermediate capital projects for inclusion in the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges' 2027–29 capital budget request.

WHEREAS, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges is responsible for submitting a single, prioritized capital budget request on behalf of the community and technical college system; and

WHEREAS, it is the current policy that once a project enters the major capital project pipeline, it remains until funded; and

WHEREAS, based on historical funding levels, projected cost escalation, and current budget practices, it is estimated that funding all major projects currently in the pipeline could take 15 to 20 years or more; and

WHEREAS, institutional needs and priorities continue to evolve, and some projects in the pipeline may no longer represent the highest priorities for their colleges; and

WHEREAS, the State Board has engaged college presidents and representatives from WACTC and commissions, including Business Affairs, Student Services, Instruction, and Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, in studying options to reduce project timelines and better align capital funding with current institutional needs; and

WHEREAS, this study recommended the creation of an intermediate capital project category, capped at $15 million, to incentivize colleges to convert existing major projects in the pipeline and allow them to move up in the system's priority order; and

WHEREAS, the Washington Association of Community and Technical College Presidents unanimously endorsed the proposed framework at their June 2025 meeting;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State

Board for Community and Technical Colleges hereby approves the framework for converting existing major capital projects in the pipeline to intermediate capital projects beginning with the 2027–29 capital budget request; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that State Board staff are authorized to implement the approved framework, procedures, and evaluation criteria, and to support colleges that elect to convert projects in preparing the system's prioritized capital request, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Executive Director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board's Policy Manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the Governor, Legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on (October 16, 2025)

Attest

Nate Humphrey, secretary

Martin Valadez, chair

COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES
Washington State Board

INTERMEDIATE CAPITAL PROJECTS

FOR THE 2025-27 BIENNIUM BUDGET REQUEST

SBCTC Capital Budget

Table of Contents

Table of Contents 2
2027-29 Capital Budget Request 3
Introduction 3
Intermediate capital projects 3
Project scope and recommended priorities 4
Evaluating Intermediate projects 4
Converting major projects to Intermediate projects for the 2027-29 capital request 4
Cost estimates 5
Space utilization 5
Schedule for submitting Intermediate project proposals for the 2027-29 biennium 6
Proposal Packet and Submittal Guidelines 7
Intermediate project submittal requirements 7
Proposal packet contents 7
Project narrative 8
Intermediate project evaluation 9
Criteria and scoring summary: 9
Team-scored criteria 9
Staff-scored criteria 10
Appendix 12
Appendix A – Checklist for Intermediate project proposal 13
Appendix B – Reasonableness of cost 15
Appendix C – Space utilization guidance for Intermediate project proposals 18
Appendix D – Order for colleges without projects in the pipeline 21

DRAFT

2027-29 Capital Budget Request

Introduction

The State Board is charged with preparing a single, prioritized request of capital projects on behalf of the community and technical college system. Beginning with the 2027-29 capital request, the State Board recognizes three categories of capital projects for its budget request.

- **Minor** works projects valued at less than $4M. Minor works projects are generally identified and developed through the biennial Facility Condition Survey, the system 2019 Infrastructure Survey, and college identified programmatic needs.
- **Intermediate** capital projects valued at less than $15 million in state appropriated funding.
- **(Large) major** capital projects valued at more than $15 million in state appropriated funding.

These instructions and guidelines have been developed to assist colleges preparing Intermediate project proposals for the 2027-29 capital request.

Consistent with Office of Financial Management (OFM) requirements, projects are further identified as either preservation or program projects in the budget submittal.

- **Preservation** projects maintain, preserve, and extend the life of existing state facilities and assets and do not significantly change the facility and building footprint to address current or anticipated program changes. Examples include renovating building systems, upgrading utility systems, and making other significant repairs.
- **Program** projects primarily achieve a programmatic goal, such as changing or improving an existing space to meet program requirements or creating a new facility or asset through construction or purchase. This category includes projects ranging from building new facilities to significant renovation of existing facilities. Programmatic projects may also improve conditions or accommodate changes in services or clientele.

Intermediate capital projects

Following a two-year planning process, the State Board approved a framework to permit colleges with projects already included in the major capital pipeline to rescope them to intermediate major capital projects. The goal is to encourage colleges to scale back large, high-cost projects in favor of smaller requests. This shift is intended to streamline the capital pipeline, accelerate the distribution of limited funds, and ensure colleges can reinvest in their facilities to address their most urgent needs more quickly than the current pipeline will allow.

DRAFT

Project scope and recommended priorities

When defining the scope of Intermediate projects, colleges should assess potential risks and shape their proposals to minimize or mitigate high-level risks in the following areas:

- Deferred maintenance and remaining asset life. Prioritize repairs and renewals that address building deficiencies, extend facility usefulness, reduce future costs, and maintain reliability.
- Space utilization and campus right-sizing. Renovate, consolidate, or remove underutilized facilities before pursuing new construction.
- Health, safety, and compliance. Ensure facilities meet seismic, life-safety, accessibility, and energy standards to protect students, staff, and visitors.
- Student success and learning environments. Modernize classrooms, labs, and student spaces to reflect current pedagogy, workforce demands, and technology integration.
- Sustainability and efficiency. Invest in energy-efficient systems and sustainable practices to reduce operating costs and greenhouse gas emissions.

Colleges should only consider new space (growth) when all other options are exhausted, as it adds continued operating costs and long-term future capital liabilities for the college and community and technical college system.

Evaluating Intermediate projects

Both subjective (team scored) and objective (staff scored) measures are included as evaluation criteria to determine if the project meets thresholds for inclusion. Priority is based on the college's current position in the CTC capital budget pipeline. An evaluation panel will apply the criteria and score subjective criteria and State Board will provide scores for objective evaluation measures based upon information provided in the submitted materials. Each college should make a strong case for how the proposed project is in the best interest of the college and system. The project proposal must specifically address the evaluation criteria. Proposals should clearly describe the facility need or problem addressed by the project and a thoughtful analysis of the proposed option to meet the need or solve the problem.

For 2027-29 the evaluation committee will be comprised of the members of the task force who worked to develop the Intermediate project process.

Converting major projects to Intermediate projects for the 2027-29 capital request

Colleges with projects in the current capital pipeline will have the opportunity, in priority order, to convert an existing major project into a new Intermediate project, advancing the new project at the same relative priority as the major project being replaced. Alternatively, a college may choose to keep its existing project in the pipeline in its current position.

After all eligible colleges with projects in the capital pipeline have had the opportunity, in priority order, to convert a major project to an Intermediate project, additional colleges will be

DRAFT

invited to submit Intermediate projects in the order identified in Appendix D until the biennial target is met. The State Board will begin with a target of four Intermediate projects in the 2027–29 biennium and increase the target by one project in each subsequent biennium. In each biennium, the solicitation will continue from where the previous biennium left off, ensuring all colleges have an opportunity over time. Colleges that convert a major project to an Intermediate project will have priority over colleges without projects in the pipeline.

Beginning with the 2027-29 biennium, the State Board's capital request will be organized into the following categories and priority, with projects within each category prioritized by rank:

- Capital administration, planning, and system emergency funding,
- Minor capital projects,
- Major projects in the pipeline which have already received design funding from the Legislature[1],
- Intermediate projects, and
- Major projects from the pipeline.

In subsequent biennia the State Board will prepare a single prioritized budget request with capital administration and minor projects receiving the highest priority, followed by intermediate projects, and then major projects from the pipeline.

Cost estimates

Colleges should include cost estimates that are professionally prepared and based on preliminary design. The estimate should be developed to Uniformat 2, Level II detail, breaking out major building systems and site infrastructure (e.g., substructure, shell, interiors, services, equipment, site work, and utilities). While full design is not expected at this stage, colleges should provide enough scope definition to allow a cost consultant, architect, or engineer to prepare a defensible estimate that includes quantities, unit costs, allowances, and assumptions.

Colleges may include budget line items for student engagement and coordination in the predesign portion of the project budget. The target cost used for evaluating reasonableness will be increased by the same amount. For 2027–29 Intermediate projects, the recommended allowances are $22,500 for student engagement and $22,500 for staff/consultant coordination.

Space utilization

Utilization measures how intensively instructional facilities (classrooms, laboratories, and other teaching spaces) are used and allows comparisons across colleges and locations. It can reveal

[1] Through the Skagit Valley College Library and Culinary Arts building project.

how efficiently space is being used, guide improvements, inform management decisions about class scheduling, or identify when renovations are needed.

Capacity utilization measures how fully a space is used relative to its design, with State targets of 22 hours per week for classrooms and 16 hours per week for laboratories. This methodology is based on the 1994 Higher Education Coordinating Board Standards for Classroom and Laboratory Facility Utilization.

Time utilization measures the proportion of scheduled instructional hours a space is actively used and is being added to Intermediate project evaluations, with targets of 60% for classrooms and 50% for laboratories.

Note that the methodology in Appendix C applies only to Intermediate project proposals and may not suit other reporting purposes.

Schedule for submitting Intermediate project proposals for the 2027-29 biennium

2025		
	October 2-3	Review by WACTC.
	October 9-10	Review by Business Affairs Commission (BAC).
	October 15-16	State Board approval of process and evaluation criteria.
	November 20	Joint WACTC-BAC academy to announce Intermediate project selection process, proposal requirements, and evaluation criteria.
	December 15	**Decision for colleges to remove projects from pipeline and opt-into Intermediate process.**
2026		
	Jan – April	Colleges prepare project submittal; State Board technical assistance.
	April 15	**Submission of Intermediate project proposals to SBCTC.**
	May	Review and evaluation by Major Project Prioritization (PRR) Task Force.
	June	SBCTC approves project list for 2027-29 budget request.
	September	Capital request due to OFM.
2027		
	January – April	Legislative session.
	May	Governor signs/enacts budget.
	July 1	Funding available for projects approved by Legislature.

DRAFT

Proposal Packet and Submittal Guidelines

Intermediate project submittal requirements

- Proposals are due to SBCTC by **5 pm, Wednesday, April 15, 2026**.
- Submit proposals in editable electronic formats (PDF, Excel, Word, etc.) to capitalbudget@sbctc.edu. The project narrative and cost estimate should not be scanned (raster) documents, nor should they have a security feature that makes it difficult to copy information from them.
- Packet format:
  - 8 ½ x 11-inch pages, with one-inch margins
  - Regular typeface, such as Arial or Times New Roman, 12-point size
  - **Do not exceed 6 pages** of responses to the Intermediate project evaluation criteria. Page limit excludes proposal checklist, cover page, table of contents, and required and optional appendices.
- Include applicable hyper-links to support claims and data in the proposal.
- SBCTC may forward copies of the project request reports to OFM, WA Student Achievement Council (WSAC) and legislative staff upon completion of the selection process.

Proposal packet contents

Intermediate project proposal packets must include the following:

- Project proposal checklist (see appendix A)
- Project narrative
  - Written responses to each of the Intermediate project evaluation criteria (6-page maximum, single-sided)
- Required attachments
  - Project information template
  - Cost estimate
    - C-100 budget form (in Excel format)
  - 25Live space utilization worksheet and backup for Fall 2025 (Excel)
  - Documentation of Executive Order 21-02 compliance
    - DAHP EZ form submittal and DAHP response
    - Tribal consultation correspondence
  - Expected use of bond/COP proceeds form
  - Local Board of Trustees resolution authorizing any local funding needed for the project.
- Recommended attachments
  - Maps, plans, diagrams and sketches.

DRAFT

Project narrative

The following criteria form the basis for the project narrative. For each criterion, provide clear, concise, and evidence-based responses. Describe the proposed project by addressing all items listed below. Your response should provide reviewers with sufficient detail to evaluate the project and will serve as the primary basis for project evaluation. Limit the project narrative to no more than six pages. Clearly identify each criterion section.

1. **Problem statement/project need.** Describe the need for the project. Explain the factors driving it, identify risks, and why it is a priority for the college. Examples of need may include facility age, condition, or deficiencies; health, safety, code, or accessibility issues; programmatic needs related to functionality, curriculum, or pedagogical changes; accreditation requirements; and alignment with workforce and community demand.
2. **Project scope.** Describe the proposed scope of work for the project. Explain the specific improvements, renovations, new construction, or system upgrades included in the project, and identify the facilities, infrastructure, or program areas that will be affected.
3. **Addressing the need.** Describe the expected outcomes and how this project will address the college's facility preservation or programmatic stated needs.

   For preservation elements/projects**:** Explain how the project corrects specific building deficiencies (e.g., roof replacement, seismic upgrades, or HVAC modernization) and extend the useful life of the facility or campus infrastructure. Describe how these improvements reduce deferred maintenance; improve life-safety, seismic, and occupant health conditions; enhance reliability and energy efficiency; or replace failing end-of-life utilities to prevent service disruptions and protect critical campus operations.

   For program elements/projects: Explain how the project addresses programmatic needs by improving or creating facilities that support instruction, workforce training, or student services (e.g., modernizing science labs, creating a student services hub, or expanding healthcare training space). Describe how these improvements enhance student learning and success, align with workforce or community needs, increase enrollment capacity or utilization, and provide flexible, technology-enabled spaces that adapt to future program demand.
4. **Institutional alignment**. Describe how this project relates to the college:
   a. Campus facility master plan,
   b. College strategic plan,
   c. Academic or instructional plan, and/or
   d. Institutional plan for serving all students inclusively.
5. **State priorities.** Describe how the proposed project supports state priorities related to:
   a. Reducing energy use intensity,
   b. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and
   c. Maximizing space efficiency and utilization.

DRAFT

Intermediate project evaluation

Criteria and scoring summary:

Team-scored criteria	Evaluator score	Multiplier	Max points	% total
1. Problem statement/project need	5	4	20	20%
2. Project scope	5	3	15	15%
3. Addressing the need	5	3	15	15%
4. Institutional alignment	8	2	16	16%
5. State priorities	5	2	10	10%
	28	Subtotal:	76	76%
Staff-scored criteria				
6. Reasonableness of cost	10	1	10	10%
7. Effective space utilization	14	1	14	14%
	24	Subtotal:	24	24%
		Total points:	**100**	

Team-scored criteria

Criteria and scoring measure	Maximum score
1. Problem statement/project need	**20 points**
Is there a strong case that supports the need for a capital project? Consider clear, compelling, and well-supported evidence of need; includes multiple sources of data or documentation (e.g., facility assessments, enrollment trends, safety reports, accreditation findings, and workforce demand); demonstrates strong alignment with college/system priorities.	Evaluator score: 0-5 Multiplier: 4
2. Project scope	**15 points**
Is there sufficient detail for reviewers to fully understand what work will be accomplished? Is the scope described with clarity and specificity; all major components, systems, and affected facilities/program areas are identified?	Evaluator score: 0-5 Multiplier: 3
3. Addressing the need	**15 points**
To what extent does the project scope directly and comprehensively satisfy the college's stated preservation or programmatic needs?	Evaluator score: 0-5 Multiplier: 3

Continued on next page.

DRAFT

4. Institutional alignment	16 points
Project is referenced and directly supports institutional priorities: a) Facility master plan. b) College strategic plan. c) Academic or instructional plan. d) Institutional plan for serving all students inclusively.	2 points per plan Multiplier: 2
5. State priorities	**10 points**
How well does the project addresses state priorities. a) Maximizing space efficiency and utilization. b) Reducing energy use intensity. c) Reducing greenhouse gas emissions.	Evaluator score: 0-5 Multiplier: 2
Possible team-scored points:	76

Staff-scored criteria

Criteria and scoring measure	Scoring range
6. Reasonableness of cost	**10 points**
<u>Facility projects:</u> • Total project cost is less than or equal to the expected cost per square foot for the facility type, escalated to the construction mid-point. • Project cost is between 100% and 111% of expected cost. • Project cost is between 111% and 137% of expected cost. • Project cost is more than 137% of expected cost. <u>Infrastructure projects:</u> • Project costs are based on a comprehensive engineering study and detailed cost estimate by applicable specialty professionals. • Project costs are based on a site survey and detailed cost estimate by an experienced project manager. • Project costs are based on opinion letter or cost estimates lacking detail	10 8 2 0 10 5 0

Continued on next page.

DRAFT

7. Effective space utilization (Fall 2025)	14 points
<u>Classroom and lab utilization:</u> • If lab utilization is at least 15 but less than 17 **and** class utilization is at least 21 but less than 23 • If either lab utilization is more than 17 **or** class utilization is more than 23. • If lab utilization is at least 12 but less than 15 **and** class utilization is at least 19 but less than 21 • If either lab utilization is less than 12 **or** class utilization is less than 19. <u>Time utilization:</u> • If time utilization is at least 60% for classrooms **and** at least 50% for labs.	8 4 2 0 6
Possible staff-scored points:	24
Total possible points:	**100**

DRAFT

Appendix

DRAFT

Appendix A – Checklist for Intermediate project proposal

College	Campus location
Project tile	UFI(s)
Primary contact for proposal:	Email

Proposal Content

- ☐ Project proposal checklist (this form).
- ☐ Project narrative (6-page limit).
- ☐ Appendices: templates, forms, exhibits, and supporting documentation for evaluation.

Minimum project requirements (eligibility)

- ☐ The facility is state-owned, or a condominium interest is held (state capital funds cannot be spent on leased space).
- ☐ Project does not include improvements to temporary or portable facilities.
- ☐ Project is a standalone phase and not dependent on another project or phase to be complete.
- ☐ Project is not an exclusive enterprise function such as bookstore, dormitory or contract food service.
- ☐ Project is not a gymnasium, recreational, or athletic facility.
- ☐ If project includes renovation or replacement, then affected buildings have been owned by the college for 20-years at the time of the request.
- ☐ Project meets LEED Silver Standard requirements.
- ☐ College has set greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals consistent with RCW 70A.45 in either policy or an action plan.
- ☐ State funding request is $15 million or less.

Required appendices

- ☐ Project information template.
- ☐ Cost estimate:
  - C-100 budget form (in Excel format).
  - Uniformat II, Level 2 cost estimate, representing the total anticipated cost of the project.
- ☐ 25Live space utilization for Fall 2025 classrooms and labs (Excel).
- ☐ Documentation of Executive Order 21-02 compliance:
  - EZ form submittal and DAHP response.
  - Tribal consultation correspondence.
- ☐ Local Board of Trustees resolution authorizing any local funding needed for the project.

DRAFT

- Links to referenced studies and technical reports.
- Relevant maps, plans, diagrams and sketches.

DRAFT

Appendix B – Reasonableness of cost

Expected project costs in 2025 dollars

The following cost data is based on information from the 2019 OFM Higher Education Facility Study that included project data from 36 community and technical college projects. The best fit Maximum Allowable Construction Cost (MACC) for these projects was escalated to July 1, 2021, using the S&P Global Market Intelligence (May 2025 edition). This index is used because it is the state's standard source for projecting construction inflation and was used in the 2019 study.

Facility Type (use code)	Expected MACC / GSF July 2021
Classrooms (100s)	$357
Science labs (200s except 250)	$381
Administration (300s)	$354
Library (400s)	$343
Day care (640)	$288
Assembly (600s except 640)	$456
Support (700s)	$360

Adjusting expected costs to construction mid-point

The following table of cost multipliers is based on the May 2025 S&P Global Market Intelligence. It is intended to adjust the expected costs as of July 1, 2021, to the anticipated mid-construction date for comparison with project estimates.

Mid-construction Date	Expected Cost Multiplier	Mid-construction Date	Expected Cost Multiplier
7/1/2021*	1.0000	8/15/2029	1.4011
8/15/2027	1.3185	11/15/2029	1.4122
11/15/2027	1.3286	2/14/2030	1.4165
2/14/2028	1.3400	5/16/2030	1.4283
5/16/2028	1.3497	8/15/2030	1.4397
8/15/2028	1.3594	11/15/2030	1.4514
11/15/2028	1.3692	2/14/2031	1.4633
2/14/2029	1.3790	5/16/2031	1.4763
5/16/2029	1.3901	8/15/2031	1.4881

DRAFT

Sample of expected facility cost ranges calculation

Construction Mid-point:	2/15/2028	
Expected Cost Multiplier:	1.3400	Appendix B
Project GSF:	65,000	Base Amount

Facility Type	Expected Cost / GSF in 2021$	Expected Cost / GSF (Mid-const)	GSF by Type	Expected Cost	Scoring ranges
Classrooms (100s)	$357	$478	39,000	$18,642,000	
Science labs (200s except 250)	$381	$511	-	$-	
Administration (300s)	$354	$474	13,000	$ 6,162,000	
Library (400s)	$343	$460	-	$-	
Day care (640)	$288	$386	13,000	$ 5,018,000	
Assembly (600s except 640)	$456	$611	-	$-	
Support (700s)	$360	$482	-	$-	
			65,000	$29,822,000	**100%**
				$33,102,420	**111%**
				$40,856,000	**137%**

*Formula: Expected Cost / GSF = Expected Cost / GSF in 2021$ * Expected Cost Multiplier GSF by Type = ASF by Type / Sum(All ASF) * GSF*

For determining Reasonableness of Cost points, the Project Cost minus the infrastructure budget is compared to the Expected Cost. When submitting a proposal that includes infrastructure, please provide a separate C100 for the infrastructure work so those costs can be clearly identified.

Reasonableness of cost for infrastructure

When preparing infrastructure cost estimates, clearly define the scope of work, including the utility system, type of work, and site constraints. Base estimates on recent bids, peer projects, or recognized cost guides, adjusting for inflation and complexity. Consult engineers or utility providers for specialized systems or preliminary estimates. Be sure to include all cost elements—construction, restoration, soft costs, contingency, and escalation—and document all assumptions, unit costs, data sources, and uncertainties to ensure the estimate is transparent and defensible.

Infrastructure cost estimates are evaluated by how well they are supported and documented. The strongest estimates clearly define scope, use recent benchmarks, include all cost elements, and fully document assumptions, making them highly reliable. Adequate estimates may rely on older or generalized data, omit some costs, or provide limited documentation, making them less

reliable for decision-making. Weak estimates lack supporting data, exclude major costs, or are vague in scope, while poor estimates are unsupported, inconsistent with benchmarks, or incomplete and therefore unusable.

DRAFT

Appendix C – Space utilization guidance for Intermediate project proposals

Space utilization is a key factor in evaluating intermediate project proposals. It measures how effectively classrooms, labs, and other instructional spaces are used, combining two metrics:

- Capacity utilization (seat use), and
- Time utilization (class duration).

All utilization data must be drawn from 25Live. Standardizing using 25Live ensures consistency across colleges. Included both state and Running Start enrollments when determining student contact hours.

Definitions

- Capacity Utilization: Efficiency of available space, calculated as total contact hours divided by total room capacity (seats).
- Time Utilization: Whether classrooms and labs are scheduled during the 45-hour instructional week (credit and non-credit). Time utilization does not consider the number of students present, only whether the space is scheduled.

Together, these measures provide a view of how efficiently instructional space is used.

Data Collection

- 45-hour Data Capture Window: All colleges must report using a standard Monday–Friday, 8:00 am–5:00 pm schedule. In addition to the required M-F, 8:00 am-5:00 pm reporting period, colleges may define an alternate 45-hour period that better reflects peak instructional activity.
- Contact Hours: Total scheduled instruction hours for state and Running Start enrollments in classrooms, labs, and other instructional spaces, collected during the first full week following the 10th instructional day of the preceding fall quarter. A contact hour is one hour of direct instructional engagement between faculty and students, which may occur through various modalities (e.g., classroom, online, hybrid, or field-based).
- Room Capacity: The maximum capacity of the space for instruction reported by the college. The room capacity should be based on the physical limitations of the space or available workstations and the method of instruction.

Examples of Capacity Calculations:

- Classroom using FEPG: 940 sq. ft. ÷ 26 sq. ft./student = 36 students.
- Classroom limited by policy: 28 seats available, but policy caps class size at 25 → capacity = 25.

DRAFT

- Hands-on automotive lab: 2 students/car × 10 cars = 20 students.
- Specialized machining lab: 16 computer workstations + 6 CNC machines (2 students per machine) → limiting factor is machines → capacity = 12 students.

Calculation Methodology

Capacity utilization rates are calculated by dividing total weekly contact hours by total room capacity across the 45-hour instructional week. Colleges must report aggregate utilization for all classrooms (FAE codes 110, 120, 130) and non-dedicated labs (FAE codes 210, 260) on a campus—not for each individual rooms.

All classrooms and labs available for scheduling must be included in the report. Rooms may only be excluded if offline for remodel, renovation, or otherwise unavailable. If any workstations, lab equipment, or spaces are excluded, colleges must provide an explanation and describe plans to improve utilization efficiency.

Capacity Utilization Formula: Contact hours ÷ number of seats (hours per seat per week). Examples:

- Classrooms: 16,590 contact hours ÷ 860 seats = 19.3 hours per seat per week.
- Labs: 4,590 contact hours ÷ 435 seats = 10.6 hours per seat per week.

Time utilization measures how frequently classrooms or labs are scheduled during the 45-hour week. It is calculated as the total hours a room is scheduled for instruction (credit or non-credit) divided by 45 hours.

Time Utilization Formula**:** Time Utilization (%) = (Hours Scheduled ÷ 45) × 100

Special Considerations

Colleges with 4- or 5-Day Weeks

- Colleges offering M–F classes align with the standard window, and utilization metrics accurately reflect activity.
- Colleges offering M–Th classes may appear to have lower time utilization since Friday is unscheduled. These colleges should define an alternate 45-hour period (e.g., M–Th 8:00–5:00) to reflect actual peak scheduling.

Technical Colleges and Non-Traditional Schedules

- Technical colleges often schedule instruction during evenings, weekends, or other non-traditional times. These hours may not be captured in the standard M–F 8:00–5:00 window, making facilities appear underutilized.
- Capacity utilization still reflects seat use, but small cohorts or equipment-limited labs may lower the apparent rate.

- To ensure fairness, technical colleges are encouraged to define an alternate 45-hour period aligned with peak instructional schedules, including evenings or weekends, so both capacity and time utilization reflect actual use.

References

- FAE Facility Coding Manual: Classrooms 110, 120, 130; non-dedicated labs 210, 260.
- FEPG: Facility Evaluation and Planning Guide for room capacity standards.
- Contact Hours: Defined in Appendix B, Chapter 4, State Board Policy Manual.
- 10th Instructional Day: Enrollment census date (State Board Policy 5.40.00).
- Instructional Days: Defined in State Board Policy 5.40.50.

DRAFT

Appendix D – Order for colleges without projects in the pipeline

Colleges without projects in the major capital project pipeline, in order of last construction funding received for a major capital project (as of 7/1/2025).

1. South Puget Sound
2. Green River
3. South Seattle
4. North Seattle
5. Walla Walla
6. Pierce Puyallup
7. Pierce Fort Steilacoom
8. Bellevue
9. Olympic
10. Whatcom

The following list represents colleges with major projects remaining in the capital project pipeline as of 7/1/2025:

College	Project	Funding Phase
Grays Harbor	Lake Swano Dam	Construct
Cascadia	CC5 Gateway Building	Construct
Edmonds	Triton Learning Commons	Construct
Renton	Health Sciences Center	Construct
Bellingham	Engineering Technology Center - Bldg. J Replacement	Design & Construct
Centralia	Teacher Education and Family Development Center	Construct
Spokane	Apprenticeship Center	Construct
Skagit	Library/Culinary Arts Building	Construct
Highline	Welcome Center for Student Success	Design & Construct
Clark	Hanna/Foster/Hawkins Complex Replacement	Design & Construct
Peninsula	Advanced Technology Center	Design & Construct
South Seattle	Rainier Hall Renovation	Design & Construct
Yakima	Prior-Kendall Hall	Design & Construct
Everett	Student & Family Resource Center	Design & Construct
Tacoma	Student Support Center	Design & Construct
Renton	Trades and Industries Building	Design & Construct
Columbia Basin	Center for Applied Science and Agriculture	Design & Construct

DRAFT

Clover Park	Center for Innovative Teaching and Community Connections	Design & Construct
South Seattle	Georgetown Campus, Building B	Design & Construct
Bates	Student Success Center	Design & Construct
Wenatchee	Immersive Technology and Engineering Center	Design & Construct
Seattle Central	Welcome Center & Edison Technical Modernization	Design & Construct
Highline	Academic Pathways and Technology Center	Design & Construct
Spokane Falls	Teaching & Learning Commons	Design & Construct
Lower Columbia	Welcome Center	Design & Construct
Shoreline	Comprehensive Student Services Center	Design & Construct
Big Bend	Health Science and Performing Arts Center	Design & Construct
Skagit	Industrial Technology & Public Safety Building	Design & Construct
Spokane	Allied Health Building	Design & Construct
Lake Washington	East Building Renovation and Expansion	Design & Construct
Bellingham	Building A Renovation & Building Y Replacement	Design & Construct
Seattle Central	Broadway Achievement Center	Design & Construct

DRAFT

DRAFT

CC BY 4.0, unless otherwise noted.

Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges