

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

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

District: \_\_\_\_\_  
Fund: \_\_\_\_\_  
Rater: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
CIP ID Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Category: \_\_\_\_\_  
Ineligible: \_\_\_\_\_

Formula Driven Scoring Criteria	School Construction A, B, F	Major Maintenance C, D, E
<b>1. Preventive maintenance program</b> (Questions 9b - 9d, 9f)		
A. Detailed summary reports of maintenance labor parameters (9b) 15 points	<u>    /15    </u>	<u>    /15    </u>
B. Detailed summary reports of PM/corrective maintenance parameters (9c) 10 points	<u>    /10    </u>	<u>    /10    </u>
C. The 5-year average expenditure for maintenance divided by the 5-year average insured replacement value, district wide. (9d) 5 points If % < 4, then (% x 1.25); If % > 4, then 5	<u>    /5    </u>	<u>    /5    </u>
D. Energy consumption reports (9f) 5 points	<u>    /5    </u>	<u>    /5    </u>
<b>3. District ranking</b> (Question 3a) Only eligible project requests are used to calculate ranking points Project #1 request = 30 points, #2 = 27 points, #3 = 24 points, Each additional project 3 points less	<u>   /30   </u>	<u>   /30   </u>
<b>4. Weighted average FCI</b> (Question 3b)	<u>   /15   </u>	<u>   /15   </u>
A. 0-0.2 FCI = 0 points		
B. $= >0.2 \geq 0.4$ FCI = 0 + 0.2 per 0.02 FCI in excess of 0.2 FCI		
C. $>0.4 \geq 0.6$ FCI = 2 + 0.5 per 0.02 FCI in excess of 0.4 FCI		
D. $>0.6 \geq 0.8$ FCI = 7 + 0.75 per 0.02 FCI in excess of 0.6 FCI		
E. $>0.8$ FCI = 15 points		
<b>5. Condition/Component Survey</b> (Question 6a) Condition survey = 0, 3, 5, 8, or 10 points	<u>   /10   </u>	<u>   /10   </u>
<b>6. Use of Prior Design Plans or Buildings System Design</b> (Questions 6b-6c)		
A. Prior Design Plan (school construction only) (6b) = 0, 2, 4, 6, 8, or 10 points OR		
B. District standard = Two points each system: Building Envelope, Plumbing, HVAC, Lighting, Power	<u>   /10   </u>	<u>   /10   </u>
<b>7. Planning &amp; design phase has been completed</b> (Question 6d-6g and Appendix B)	<u>   /25   </u>	<u>   /25   </u>
A. All required elements of planning = 10 points		
B. All elements planning + required elements of schematic design = 20 points		
C. All elements of planning and schematics + required elements of design development = 25 points		
<b>8. Prior AS 14.11 funding for this project</b> (Questions 8f & 7a) Phased funding = 30 points, Supplemental funding = 15 points, No previous funding = 0 points	<u>   /30   </u>	<u>   /30   </u>
<b>9. Unhoused students today</b> (Questions 5a-5g)	<u>   /50   </u>	<u>  N/A  </u>
A. 100 % of capacity = 0 points		
B. > 100% of capacity = One point for each 3% of excess capacity		
C. 250 % of capacity = 50 points		
<b>10. Unhoused students in seven years (5 year Post-occupancy)</b> (Questions 5a-5g) Unhoused due to loss of eligible square footage based on external environmental factors is scored at half of the points identified.	<u>   /30   </u>	<u>  N/A  </u>
A. 100 % of capacity = 0 points		
B. > 100% of capacity = One point for each 5% of excess capacity		
C. 250 % of capacity = 30 points		
<b>11. Type of space added or improved</b> (Question 3j)	<u>   /30   </u>	<u>  N/A  </u>
A. Instructional or resource 30 points		
B. Support teaching 25 points		
C. Food service, recreational, and general support 15 points		
D. Supplemental 10 points		
<b>Formula-Driven</b>	<b>Total Points</b>	
	<u>   /265   </u>	<u>   /155   </u>

## Capital Improvement Project Application Evaluative Rating Form

Adopted by the Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee

District: \_\_\_\_\_  
Fund: \_\_\_\_\_  
Rater: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
CIP ID Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Category: \_\_\_\_\_  
Ineligible: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Evaluative Scoring Criteria	School Construction A, B, F	Major Maintenance C, D, E
<b>1. Effectiveness of preventive maintenance program</b> (Question 9)		
A. Maintenance Management Narrative (9a)	<u>    /5    </u>	<u>    /5    </u>
B. Energy Management Narrative (9e)	<u>    /5    </u>	<u>    /5    </u>
C. Custodial Narrative (9g)	<u>    /5    </u>	<u>    /5    </u>
D. Maintenance Training Narrative (9h)	<u>    /5    </u>	<u>    /5    </u>
E. Capital Planning Narrative (9i)	<u>    /5    </u>	<u>    /5    </u>
<b>2. Seriousness of life/safety and code conditions</b> (Question 4a)	<u>    /70   </u>	<u>    /70   </u>
<b>3. Reasonableness &amp; completeness of cost or cost estimate</b> (Questions 7a-7c)	<u>    /30   </u>	<u>    /30   </u>
<b>4. Emergency conditions</b> (Question 8a) Did application check "yes"? <input type="checkbox"/> Did discussion support emergency status? <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>    /50   </u>	<u>    /50   </u>
<b>5. Existing space fails to meet or inadequately serves existing or proposed elementary or secondary programs</b> (Question 8b)	<u>    /40   </u>	<u>    /5+   </u>
<b>6. Thoroughness in considering a full range of options for the project</b> (Question 8c)	<u>    /25   </u>	<u>    /25   </u>
<b>7. Relationship of the project cost to the annual operational cost savings</b> (Question 8d)	<u>    /30   </u>	<u>    /30   </u>
<b>8. Thoroughness in considering use of alternative facilities to meet the needs of the project</b> (Question 5g)	<u>    /5    </u>	<u>    N/A   </u>
<b>Evaluative</b>	<b>Total Points</b>	
	<u>    /275   </u>	<u>    /235   </u>