



BAC Academy
February 21, 2019

RECOMMENDED CHANGES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE 2021-23 CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST

Linda Schoonmaker
Vice President of Finance and Administration
Big Bend Community College

Wayne Doty
Capital Budget Director
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges



WACTC CAPITAL TASK FORCE FOR AY1819

<u>Commission/Council</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>College</u>
Business Affairs	Michael Pham	Highline
Business Affairs	Linda Schoonmaker	Big Bend
Operations & Facilities	Marty Mattes	South Puget Sound
Instruction	Sachi Horback	Clark
Diversity & Equity	Gloria Ngezaho	Shoreline
Student Services	Deb Casey	Green River

BACKGROUND

There are always requests for more funding than the state has. To help legislators decide what to fund they require us to submit a prioritized request. Our system uses criteria to prioritize and size our capital requests. We continue to update the criteria to keep it relevant.

We have several goals for state capital funding that can create tension in the selection criteria. Those goals include supporting our mission, taking care of what we have, to be consistent with college plans, and to not have a single square foot we don't need.

CHARGES

1. Incorporate definition of infrastructure eligible for our budget request per the AY1718 infrastructure task force recommendation.
2. Incorporate new criteria and guidance for scoring per the AY1718 “built environment” task force recommendations. Provide examples.
3. Consider major project criteria for fiscal viability of the college, regional coordination of programs in proposals, or how projects can be flexible and adaptable to adapt to program changes.
4. How can the request process be simplified so consultants are not needed? Or, how can we assure A/E firms have training to prepare proposals? Look at creating an “on call” list of qualified consultants with DES.
5. Review delays in state funding for local acquisitions aka: “pig in a poke” rules.
6. Review funding of ADA issues and provide summary of best practices.



These are **DRAFT**
recommendations.
Your feedback is
appreciated.

MARK-UP OF MAJOR PROJECT SCORING CRITERIA





1.

Incorporate definition of infrastructure eligible for our budget request per the AY1718 infrastructure task force recommendation.

Add “non-potable water” and “steam” to the list of infrastructure that can be included in a major project. (see page 8)

2.

Incorporate new criteria and guidance for scoring per the AY1718 “built environment” task force recommendations. Provide examples.

Add definition/clarification to Appendix J of the major project criteria for the terms “statistically relevant,” “Indicated,” and “likely.” *(see pages 26 and 27)*

Renton and South Puget Sound examples *(starting on page 28)*

3.

Consider major project criteria for fiscal viability of the college, regional coordination of programs in proposals, or how projects can be flexible and adaptable to adapt to program changes.

Not recommending any change related to this.

3. WHY NO CHANGE?

The process for approving new professional/technical programs includes a requirement for continual review of their viability and effectiveness.

The process for approving new transfer degree programs includes an opportunity for neighboring colleges to challenge them.

In the Statement of Need for a new baccalaureate degree programs there is an evaluation of the regional demand for the program.

Recognizing programs can change much more frequently than we can build buildings, proposals for the 2019-21 major project selection process were to include a description of how the project would include flexible and adaptable space.

There are best practices and case studies for flexible space design in the community and technical college system on our website.

4.A

How can the request process be simplified so consultants are not needed?

Colleges are not required to use consultants. To reduce the work needed, remove the following criteria that are not necessary for submitting the budget request and are not likely to affect the project cost.

1. Cost estimates for non-preferred alternatives (*see pages 1, 2, 3, and 14*)
2. Potential issues with the surrounding neighborhood, during construction and ongoing (*see page 1*)
3. Americans with Disabilities Act implementation (*see pages 11 and 12*)
4. Identify and justify the proposed project delivery method (*see page 2*)

4.B

How can we assure A/E firms have training to prepare proposals?

Create a submittal checklist.

The system holds workshops on budget development and colleges have been encouraged to invite their project managers and consultants to attend with them. In the past, consultants have been part of the workshop program.

4.C

Look at creating an “on call” list of qualified consultants with DES.

No change.

The Attorney General’s office has determined that the preparation of a project proposal is part of the public work process administered by the Department of Enterprise Services. DES has a central file of consultant qualifications, an on-call list of consultants, and a process for selecting other consultants for public work projects. DES has waived their project management and administration fee for community and technical college proposals in the past.

5.

Review delays in state funding for local acquisitions aka: “pig in a poke” rules.

Not recommending any change to the current practices of a six year wait for minor repair funding, access to system-wide emergency, and hazardous material pools; Nor the current twenty-year wait for use of acquisitions in major renovation or replacement projects.

However, these practices should be better documented.

Recommend the state board...

- **add these waiting periods to state board policy manual. Policy 6.40, Chapter 6 Appendix D, Chapter 6 Appendix E, Policy 6.50.10.**
- **update the general guidelines in the facility condition survey to be consistent with the policy**
- **update the emergency funding guidance on state board website to be consistent with the policy**

6.

Review funding of ADA issues and provide summary of best practices.

Recommend state board staff provide OCR level facility review for items that would qualify for capital funding at the colleges that are planned for OCR review in next four years as part of the facility condition survey each biennium. Note, this does not change the rubric for determining a building condition score.

State appropriation to correct these OCR deficiencies would be requested for the subsequent biennium. It is understood that the colleges subject to OCR review in any given year may change.

6. OCR REVIEW PLAN

OCR Review	College	Source	FCS Review	Budget
AY19	Spokane Falls	2017-19 OCR Targeting Plan	Budget request in past	2019-21
AY19	Grays Harbor	2017-19 OCR Targeting Plan	Budget request in past	2019-21
AY20	Seattle Central	2017-19 OCR Targeting Plan	CY19	2021-23
AY20	Spokane CC	2017-19 OCR Targeting Plan	CY19	2021-23
AY21	Highline	Next on list in AY1921 ranking	CY19	2021-23
AY21	Green River	Next on list in AY1921 ranking	CY19	2021-23
AY22	Everett	Next on list in AY1921 ranking	CY19	2021-23
AY22	Walla Walla	Next on list in AY1921 ranking	CY19	2021-23
AY23	Peninsula	Next on list in AY1921 ranking	CY21	2023-25
AY23	Skagit Valley	Next on list in AY1921 ranking	CY21	2023-25
AY24	Clover Park	Next on list in AY1921 ranking	CY21	2023-25
AY24	South Seattle	Next on list in AY1921 ranking	CY21	2023-25
AY25	Clark	Next on list in AY1921 ranking	CY23	2025-27
AY25	Shoreline	Next on list in AY1921 ranking	CY23	2025-27
AY26	Whatcom	Next on list in AY1921 ranking	CY23	2025-27
AY26	Bellingham	Next on list in AY1921 ranking	CY23	2025-27

NEXT STEPS

- 3rd and final task force meeting on March 15th to:
 - Finalize recommended major project criteria
 - Finalize process recommendations
- Present recommendations to WACTC Capital on March 21, 2019
- Participate in WACTC Capital Academy on April 4, 2019
- Present recommendations to SBCTC on May 1, 2019