



Guidelines for Raters of the CIP Application

Introduction

The Department of Education & Early Development is charged with the task of compiling a prioritized list of projects to be used in preparing a six-year capital plan for submittal to the governor and the legislature (AS 14.11.013(a)(3)). The criteria for accomplishing the priorities are established in statute (AS 14.11.013(B)) and are awarded points based on a scoring system developed by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee under its statutorily imposed mandate (AS 14.11.014(b)(6)).

The guidelines provided here are to assure that raters are using a common set of terms and standards when awarding points for the evaluative scoring criteria.

Basis for Rating Applications

The following positions will define the base philosophy for rating applications.

Since districts are required to submit a request for a capital project no later than September 1 of the year preceding the fiscal year for which they are applying, no rater shall review, rank, or give feedback regarding scoring a project prior to this deadline.

Applications will be ranked based on the information submitted with the application, or applicants may use information submitted to the department in support of a project, provided the submission occurs on or before September 1 and is identified as an attachment to an application. Each rater shall arrive at the initial ranking of each project independently. Raters will be expected to go through each application question by question. They will also review all attachments for content, completeness, and bearing on each scoring element. Consistency in scores from year-to-year shall be considered. It is expected that projects will demonstrate different levels of completeness in descriptions and detail depending on the stage of project development.

Projects are prioritized in two lists, the School Construction List and the Major Maintenance List, and reflect the two statutory funds established for education capital projects. Under the definitions provided in statute and regulation, projects which add space to a facility are classed as School Construction projects and must fall in categories A, B, F, or G. Major maintenance projects (categories C, D, and E) may not include additional space for unhoused students. Only projects in which the primary purpose is Protection of Structure, Code Compliance, or Achieve an Operating Cost Savings, where the work includes renewal, replacement, or consolidation of existing building systems or components, should be considered as maintenance projects.

Each rater should have an eligibility checklist available during rating. Eligibility items A, F, G, I, J, L, and N will be evaluated by each rater. Other eligibility items will be the responsibility of support team members doing data input and capacity/allowable calculations. Discussion regarding project eligibility should be brought to the attention of the rating team as soon as it becomes an issue in one person's mind.

Evaluative Rating Guidelines

For each of the evaluative rating categories, raters will consider the factors listed when evaluating and scoring applications. The list is not exclusive, nor exhaustive. As raters read and evaluate projects, review of the listed elements is to be done for referential purposes. Raters should also refer to the Application Instructions for each question.

Code deficiencies / Protection of structure / Life safety

(Application Question 4a; Points possible: 50)

- Points will be assigned for code deficiency, protection of structure, or life safety conditions when the application documents the deficiency, the need for correction, and how the project corrects the deficiency. A condition may only receive points in one scoring area.
- Simply identifying a condition in the application will not necessarily generate points. A well-described and documented condition that provides for full evaluation and point awards will include specificity, with attached documentation to support the narrative.
- Age of building system is considered based on the application calendar year.
- A project can address a single condition or multiple conditions. Evaluate the severity of each condition. Incremental point adjustments from those provided in the below matrix may be provided for severity, the nature of the item, and effect on the school facility.
- Does the project scope combine severe and non-severe or critical and non-critical conditions? Inclusion of unrelated non-severe or non-critical conditions in a project will reduce the overall score of the project based on a percentage of project cost.
- Points for mixed-conditions can total more than the possible points. Combined points are weighted using a ratio of construction cost for correcting scored conditions to the total requested construction cost of the project.
- Per 4 AAC 31.022(c)(8), scoring of mixed-scope projects will be weighted.

Points will be assigned using the following suggested guidelines.

Structural Condition Issue	Pts
Seismic - no restrictions	3
Foundation/Floor - no PE	4
Seismic - minimal restrictions	6
Upper Floor Structure - no PE	9
Vertical Structure - no PE	9
Roof Structure - no PE	10
Foundation/Floor - PE	15
Seismic - moderate restriction	15
Upper Floor Structure - PE	20
Vertical Structure - PE	20
Roof Structure - PE	24
Seismic/Gravity Partial Closure ¹	28
Seismic/Gravity Full Closure ¹	50

Roof/Envelope Condition Issue	Pts
Siding Failure, age <25yr	2
Siding Finish	2
Doors, age >20yr	3
Roof, age >Warranty +5yr ³	3
Trim/Flashings, age >25yr	6
Roof, age Warranty +10yr ³	6
Roof Leaks - avg WO<3/yr ²	8
ASHRAE 90.1 Windows ⁴	8
ASHRAE 90.1 Insulation ⁴	10
Siding Material, age >25yr	12
Windows, age >30yrs	12
Siding Failure, age <30yr	15
Roof Leaks, avg WO >3/yr ²	15
Doors w/ Egress issues	15
Roof Leaks affect space, w/ WO documentation	25

Arch/Interior/ADA Condition Issue	Pts
ADA - 1 issue	1
ADA - 2 issues	2
DEC Sanitation	2
ADA - 3 issues	3
Ceiling Finishes age >25yr	3
Wall Finishes age >25yr	3
ADA - 4 issues	4
Floor Finishes >15yr	4
Building Egress	10
Rated Assemblies	12
Codes + Arch (each system)	+3

Mechanical Condition Issue	Pts
DDC Deficiency	3
Narrative, System age >30yr	4
Ventilation, WO <3/yr ²	5
Plumbing, WO <3/yr ²	6
Heating, WO <3/yr ²	7
Pneumatic Controls	8
Ventilation, WO >3/yr ²	9
Plumbing, WO >3/yr ²	10
Heating, WO >3/yr ²	11
Codes: Ventilation	12
Codes: Plumbing	12
Codes: Heating	13
Codes + PE (each system)	+3
Boilers, 1 of 2 Non-op	13
HVAC age >40yr	15
Boilers, 2 of 3 Non-op	18
Mechanical Systems, WO >5/yr ²	21
Heating Failure	25

Electrical Condition Issue	Pts
Narrative, Lighting age >25yr	2
Narrative, Electrical age >30yr	4
Power, WO <3/yr ²	4
Lighting, WO <3/yr ²	4
Back-up Generator In-operable	5
Egress/EM lights, WO <3/yr ²	5
Power, WO >3/yr ²	7
Lighting, WO >3/yr ²	7
Egress/EM lights, WO >3/yr ²	8
Intercom Issues, WO >3/yr ²	8
Codes, Lighting	10
Codes, Power	10
Codes + PE (each system)	+3
Intercom Failure	10
Electrical, age >40yr	15
Light Levels, <50% of code	16
Electrical Systems, WO >5/yr ²	21
Power Failure	25

Fire Alarm/Sprinkler Condition Issue	Pts
Narrative, Fire Alarm age >15yr	2
Narrative, Sprinkler >30yr	2
Heads Failing, age >30yr	5
Sprinkler Coverage Gaps	5
Non-addressable FA	6
FA/Sprinkler, WO >1/yr ²	8
Heads Failing, age >40yr	10
FA/Sprinkler, WO >3/yr ²	15
Fire Alarm Non-op, <3 floors	17
FA/Sprinkler, WO >5/yr ²	20
Fire Alarm Non-op, >3 floors	25
Sprinkler Non-op	30

Site Condition Issue	Pts
Vehicle Surfaces	3
Walkways and Surfaces	4
Drainage Issues	6
Playground Code	12
Wastewater Issues	15
Water Issues	16
Wastewater Failure	24
Water Failure	25

UST/AST/HazMat Condition Issue	Pts
HazMat (all) Low Exposures	3
Narrative, UST age >30yr	2
Narrative, AST age >40yr	5
Sewage Lagoon Failure/ Exposure	5
UST/AST Leak	7
USCG/40 CFR Cite	10
HazMat (all) Mod Exposures	10
HazMat (all) High Exposures	22

Definitions:

Arch = documented by a licensed Architect
 PE = documented by a Professional Engineer
 No PE = not documented by a Professional Engineer
 WO = Work Orders provided w/ application

Notes:

- ¹ If district does not qualify for space, points limited to 15.
- ² Average of prior 3 years, provide work orders. See application instructions.
- ³ Provide copy of roof warranty.
- ⁴ Provide existing R-value or code violation of system.

Regional community facilities

(Application Question 5h; Points possible: 5)

- Is a community “inventory” provided?
- Where reasonable alternative facilities have been identified, is there documentation with the facility owner regarding availability?
- Consider the effort/results in identifying alternative facilities and the rationale behind the viability of the alternative facility.
- Were judgments about the viability of alternate facilities made with “institutional knowledge”, professional assessment, third party objectivity, and/or economic analysis?
- Are facilities listed in a narrative discussion or are they documented with supplemental data such as photos, maps, facility profile, etc.?
- This point category is only applicable to construction projects.

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified. The rationale behind the viability of the alternative facilities has been provided and judgments are made using institutional knowledge, third party objectivity, economic analysis, etc. The narrative discussion is documented with photos, maps, facility profiles, etc.	5 points
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified. The rationale behind the viability of the alternative facilities has been provided and judgments are made using institutional knowledge, third party objectivity, economic analysis, etc.	4 points
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified. The rationale behind the viability of the alternative facilities has been provided.	3 points
A community inventory is provided and reasonable alternative facilities have been identified.	2 points
A community inventory is provided.	1 point
Question has not been answered	0 points

Cost estimate for total project cost

(Application Questions 7a - 7c; Points possible: 0-30)

- Check to assure that the estimate matches the proposed project scope.
- Primary evaluation should test both the “reasonableness” and the “completeness” of the cost estimate (i.e., How well can this estimate be used to advocate for this project?).
- Check for double entries, including factored items, cost after adjustment for geographic factor, and percentages and justification (with backup) when percentages exceed DEED guidelines.
- Review and evaluate backup for cost estimate including lump sum or actual construction costs.
- Rating considers the full range of estimates: from conceptual to detail design to actual construction costs. It should be noted that because this scoring element covers the full

range of estimate possibilities, it is anticipated that conceptual estimates score less than more detailed construction estimates and actual construction cost documentation.

- Completed project costs are supported by competitive selection documentation, and DEED-approval of in-house labor or an alternative procurement method, as needed.

Points reflect the reasonableness and completeness evaluation and will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on construction document level cost estimate, bid tabulations, or actual invoices.	27-30 points
The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on 65% design development level specifications and drawings.	23-26 points
The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on 35% schematic design level documents.	18-22 points
The estimate matches the scope of work, is reasonable and complete with no double entries, adjustments are accurate, justification and backup is provided when estimate exceeds DEED guidelines, and all lump sums amounts are described and supported. The estimate is based on concept design level documents. The DEED demand cost model is acceptable as a planning/ concept level cost estimate.	12-17 points
The cost estimate is not adequately developed to support concept level costs. Components may not be present to confirm scope of work, reasonableness and completeness or other elements. Project may be at an early preliminary stage.	6-11 points
Construction costs are not supported or many cost elements are missing.	1-5 points

Emergency conditions

(Application Question 8a; Points possible: 50)

- If the district doesn't declare the project an emergency, points will not be awarded.
- Consider the ranking of the project on the district six-year plan.
- Consider the "level of threat" to both people and property in assessing the emergency.
- Consider the "nature" of the emergency.
- Consider the "impact" on the use of the facility due to the emergency condition.
- Consider the "immediacy" of the emergency (how time critical is it?).
- Consider the level of description and documentation provided.
- Consider whether the description provided is congruent with other application elements.

- Does the project scope include non-emergency conditions? Scoring of mixed-scope projects, which address both emergency and non-emergency conditions, should be weighted based on the amount of emergency work that is included in the project.

Points will be assigned in increments according to the level of threat using the following suggested guidelines. High threat emergency projects with high emergency points are infrequent.

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Building is destroyed or rendered functionally unsafe for occupancy and requires the building to be demolished and rebuilt. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy of the emergency, the circumstances of the loss of the building, and that the students are currently unhoused.	50 points
Building is unsafe and the entire student population is temporarily unhoused. The building requires substantial repairs to be made safe for the student population to occupy the building. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy of the emergency and the narrative explains any mitigation the district has taken to address the emergency.	25-45 points
Building is occupied by the student population. A local or state official has issued an order that the building will need to be repaired by a certain date or the district will have to vacate the building. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation from the local or state official providing the date when the repairs need to be completed. The documentation addresses the immediacy of the emergency and the narrative explains any mitigation the district has taken to address the emergency.	5-25 points
A portion of the building requires significant repair or replacement of damaged portion of building. The damaged portion of the building cannot be used for educational purposes. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy for the emergency, the circumstances surrounding the damaged portion of the building, and the portion of the building that is not available for educational purposes.	5-45 points
A major building component or system has completely failed and is no longer repairable. The failed system or component has rendered the facility unusable to the student population until replaced. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the immediacy of the emergency, the circumstances of the failure, and that the students are currently unhoused.	25-45 points
A major building component or system has a high probability of completely failing in the near future. The component or system has failed, but has been repaired and has limited functionality. If the component fails the district may be required to restrict use of the building until the component or system is repaired or replaced. The emergency narrative is supported by documentation that addresses the high probability of the failure and documents the requirement to restrict use of the building until corrected.	5-25 points

Inadequacies of Existing Space

(Application Question 8b; Points possible: 40)

- Scoring is based on the described and documented inability of existing space to adequately serve the instructional program. Points are not awarded for code violations.
- Consider the adequacy of the space in terms of both form and function, crowding, and upgrades to space that support the instructional program.
- Balance consideration of educational adequacy of physical arrangement versus functional factors.
- Scoring should take into consideration whether the inadequate space is for a mandatory instructional program or a new or existing local program.
- Does the project include improvements to functionally adequate space? Scoring of projects with functionally adequate space and inadequate space should weight the amount of work improving inadequate space that is included in the project.

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
The existing space as described and documented is significantly inadequate to meet state mandated instructional programs, facility is severely overcrowded, and the project is to add or upgrade state mandated instructional space. Documentation such as a condition survey, design narrative, or space calculations can be used to support the inadequacies of the existing space.	25-40 points
The existing space as described and documented is not adequate to meet state mandated or proposed new or existing local instructional programs, facility is moderately overcrowded, and the project is to add or upgrade state mandated instructional or proposed new or existing local instructional space. Documentation such as a condition survey, design narrative, or space calculations can be used to support the inadequacies of the existing space.	11-24 points
The existing space as described and documented is not adequate to meet state mandated or proposed new or existing local instructional programs, facility has minor or no overcrowding, and the project is to add or upgrade state mandated instructional or proposed new or existing local instructional space.	1-10 points
A major maintenance project that describes and documents the inadequacy of the existing space that is an additional condition being addressed in the project.	0-5 points

Other options

(Application Question 8c; Points possible: 25)

- Consider how completely this topic is addressed. Does the discussion provide alternatives and details that support a strong vetting of the project options?
- Consider the range of options considered and the rigor of the comparison to each other. Does the comparison of options support the project chosen?
- Scoring should increase in accordance with the amount of detailed information; graduated into three levels of: 1) unsupported narrative, 2) well supported narrative, and 3) detailed cost analysis.

- Consider boundary changes where applicable.
- For installed mechanical equipment, was a re-conditioned or re-built option considered in lieu of new?
- For over-crowding, was double shifting or other alternatives considered?

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
Were the options considered viable alternatives? The options are fully described viable options that are supported by a life-cycle cost analysis and cost benefits analysis that compare the cost of the options; an explanation is provided for the rationale behind the selection of the preferred option. Documentation is submitted that supports the options, analysis, and conclusion. The options contain the proposed project and at least two other viable options.	21-25 points
The options are fully described viable options that include cost comparisons between options. An explanation is provided for the rationale behind the selection of the preferred option; however, no life cycle cost analysis is included. Documentation is submitted that supports the options, analysis, and conclusion. The options contain the proposed project and at least two other viable options.	11-20 points
A description is included for each option; however, the options are not supported with additional documentation or cost analysis. The options contain the proposed project and at least one other viable option.	1-10 points

Annual operating cost savings

(Application question 8d; Points possible: 30)

- This should be rated based on information provided which specifically address this issue.
- Evaluation should be based on district provided data and analysis rather than opinion.
- Top scores should be reserved for those projects that can demonstrate a payback within a relatively brief period of time.
- Should be consistent with life cycle cost analysis and cost benefit analysis (if provided). This may have either a positive or a negative relationship to justification of a project.
- Evaluation may reward efforts to contain or reduce operating costs even if the project doesn't save money or have a payback (i.e. – utilizing LEED or CHPS standards for construction).

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Point Range
A detailed breakdown of projected annual operational cost savings compared to the project cost. The analysis should be consistent with a life cycle cost analysis or cost benefit analysis which is submitted with the project. The projected operational cost savings have a documented, detailed payback of 10 years or less.	21-30 points
A detailed breakdown of projected annual operational cost savings compared to the project cost. The analysis should be consistent with a life cycle cost analysis or cost benefit analysis which is submitted with the project. The projected operational cost savings have a documented, detailed payback of between 10 and 20 years.	11-20 points
A summary analysis that includes a projected annual operational cost savings compared to the project cost. The projected operational cost savings documents efforts to contain or reduce operating costs and has a payback that exceeds 20 years.	6-10 points
Stated opinion regarding estimated cost savings that could be achieved with the project.	1-5 points

District preventive maintenance and facilities management

(Application Questions 9a, 9e-9h; Points possible: 25 evaluative)

Maintenance Management Narrative

(Application Question 9a; Points possible: 5)

- Does the described program address preventive maintenance as well as routine?
- How well does the program work for each individual school?
- Does the program address all building components? Mechanical, electrical, structural, architectural, exterior/civil?
- Is there evidence supplied which demonstrates that the program is effective?
- Who participates in the program and how does it function?

Energy Management Narrative

(Application Question 9e; Points possible: 5)

- Is the district engaged in reducing energy consumption in its facilities?
- Is a comprehensive set of methods being used?
- Is the program districtwide in scope?
- Is the program achieving results?
- Is there a method for reviewing and monitoring energy usage?
- Is there a method for evaluating existing facilities' need for commissioning?

Custodial Narrative

(Application Question 9f; Points possible: 5)

- Is the district's custodial program complete?
- Is custodial program based on quantities from building inventories and frequency of care based on industry practice?
- Has the district customized its program to be specific to each facility?
- Is the program districtwide in scope?
- Is the program achieving results?

Maintenance Training Narrative

(Application Question 9g; Points possible: 5)

- Does the program address training and on-going education of the maintenance staff?
- Are maintenance personnel being trained in specific building systems?
- Are training schedules attached?
- How is Training Recorded?
- How is effectiveness measured?

Capital Planning Narrative

(Application Question 9h; Points possible: 5)

- Does the district have a process for identifying capital renewal needs?
- Are component/subsystem replacement cycles identified and used?
- Does the system involve building occupants and users?
- Are renewal schedules comprehensive and vetted for credibility?
- Are systems up for renewal grouped into logical capital projects?
- Does review of projects on six-year plan show evidence of use of capital planning process, including renewal and replacement scheduled.

Formula-Driven Guidelines

Condition/Component survey

(Application question 6a; Points possible: 0-10 – non-evaluative)

- Condition/component survey age is relative to the earlier of either the application submittal deadline or the project's substantial completion.

Points will be assigned in increments using the following suggested guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Points
Condition/component survey is a comprehensive product that informs the project. It includes a full description of existing systems, including code deficiencies, and provides recommendations for upgrades related to all deficiencies described. Costs associated with each deficiency and upgrades are provided as applicable. Supplements may be included such as special inspections, engineering calculations, photographs, drawings, etc. Floor plans, with building area designations and room identifications, are encouraged. Portions of the condition survey, such as that information pertaining to building codes and analysis of structural engineered systems, may have been completed by an architect, engineer, or persons with documented expertise in a building system. It is less than 6 years old.	10 points
Condition/component survey contains many of the required elements as listed above, but not all. It is less than 10 years old.	8 points
Condition/component survey informs the project. Supplements such as special inspections, engineering calculations and drawings that would further document conditions justifying the project are not provided or documentation is not substantial. It is less than 10 years old.	5 points
Condition/component survey is more than 10 years old, but may still contain some relevant building information pertaining to the project.	3 points
Condition/component survey has not been submitted or does not inform the project.	0 points

Use of prior school design

(Application Question 6b; Points possible: 10)

- Are complete documents of the proposed reused school plans provided?
- Is evidence of ownership of proposed reused school plans provided?
- Has an analysis been done of the anticipated deviations and revisions from the proposed reused school plan been accomplished? Is an estimated cost of those deviations (+ or -) been computed?.
- Have design and construction costs for the proposed reused school plans been estimated along with an estimated cost of design and construction for a project alternative for a new school design?
- This point category is only applicable to construction projects.

Points will be assigned in increments using the following general guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Points
1. The district or municipality owns the reused school plans. 2. The reused school plans are less than 5 years old or have been updated within the prior 5 years. 3. A supported estimate of planned deviations from the reused school plans is less than 1% of the estimated cost of construction. 4. A supported estimate of construction cost savings to the project is greater than 10% of construction costs of a new school plan alternative. 5. A supported estimate of design cost savings to the project is greater than 10% of design services costs of a new school plan alternative.	10 points
Any four of the above factors are achieved.	8 points
Any three of the above factors are achieved.	6 points
Any two of the above factors are achieved.	4 points
Any one of the above factors is achieved.	2 points
None of the above factors are achieved.	0 points

Use of prior building system design

(Application Question 6c; Points possible: 10)

- Up to two points are available for capital renewal of a complete system, a subsystem, or a component renewal in each of the following systems: 1) Building Envelope, 2) Plumbing, 3) HVAC, 4) Lighting, and 5) Power.
- Has evidence been provided that the identified building system is part of a written standard that meets ASHRAE 90.1-2010 prescriptive requirements?
- This point category is not applicable to projects receiving scores for use of a prior school design.

Points will be assigned in increments using the following general guidelines:

Scoring Criteria	Points
The reused building system design is part of a provided written municipal or school district building system standard.	2 points