

Capital Improvements Committee (CIC)
Scoring Criteria Proposed Updates
Temporary Workgroup



Scoring Criteria Update

A - IMPACT weights for review/updates:

- ✓ Fleet (and Bus) replacement program(s) weights/Review of current Net Annual Operating Costs Impact/ROI criteria).
 - Fleet and Bus replacements (and requesting departments in general) could achieve higher scores in this area by providing additional information relating to the financial operating impacts related to each project.
 - The current Impact weights in this category can be streamlined by modifying the existing percent-based impact model to a less complex model.



Scoring Criteria Update

A - Update Option

- 2 Pt Example:
 - Replacement of the Wilson Sr Center HVAC is anticipated to generate utility savings as it is replacing a less efficient system that is 30 years old.
- 5 Pt Example:
 - Based on MCTS analysis, buses with mileage over 250k are approximately \$50k more expensive to maintain and operate on an annual basis. The 2020 capital request includes 25 buses that are near or over 250k miles.



CRITERIA	IMPACT
*NET Annual Impact on Operating Costs	5 – <u>Significant Documentation Provided (including major net operational savings)</u> Major impact (Reduces Div/Section Ops Costs by 25%) 3 – Moderate impact (Reduces Div/Section Ops Costs by 10% – 24%) 2 – Minor/General data provided <u>Minor impact (Reduces Div/Section Ops Costs by 1% – 9%)</u> 0 – No impact

Scoring Criteria Update

B - IMPACT weights for review/updates:

✓ **Technology IMPACT to support security risks mitigation**

- (possibly incorporate into existing Life/Safety criteria)
 - Security related technology issues don't currently fit within the existing capital scoring process
- Update Option (can be modified)
 - Incorporate a (5 Pt) Technology Security IMPACT weight under the existing Life-Safety CRITERIA:



CRITERIA	IMPACT
<p><u>1.) Safety</u> – The project contributes to health, safety, and-welfare, <u>and/or technology security.</u></p>	<p>10 – Eliminates an existing hazard <i>Addresses an existing life-safety Hazard that is posing an immediate threat to health and safety (within the 1st year).</i></p> <p>5 – Eliminates a potential hazard <i>Remedies a Hazard that would pose a threat to health and safety in the future (i.e. the next 2 - 3 years), but does not demand immediate attention.</i></p> <p><u>OR</u></p> <p>5 – Mitigates technology security risk <u><i>Addresses a known risk posing a security threat to County data and/or technology assets (i.e. the next 1 - 3 years), but does not demand immediate attention.</i></u></p> <p>0 – No Safety Impact</p>

Scoring Criteria Update

C - CRITERIA for review/inclusion:

✓ **Racial Equity scoring Criteria**

- Impact weights based on the % of the TBD populations served by each project.

OR

- If data from the item above is not available, then impact weights reflecting the % of the TBD populations within a neighborhood will be used.
- Projects would be scored by Office of African American Affairs (OAAA) based on the Criteria/Impact weights (noted above) and then included into the overall CIC scoring matrix.
- Include OAAA staff as part of the CIC (staff) sub-committee review of project requests.



Scoring Criteria Update

C - Update Option

- Impact weights range from 0 to 5.

CRITERIA	IMPACT
<u>6.) Racial Equity</u>	<p><u>5 – 76-100% TBD population served (PRIMARY) OR TBD population of Zip Code where the project is located (SECONDARY).</u></p> <p><u>4 – 51%-75% TBD population served (PRIMARY) OR TBD population of Zip Code where the project is located (SECONDARY).</u></p> <p><u>3 – 26%-50% TBD population served (PRIMARY) OR TBD population of Zip Code where the project is located (SECONDARY).</u></p> <p><u>2 – 15%-25% TBD population served (PRIMARY) OR TBD population of Zip Code where the project is located (SECONDARY).</u></p> <p><u>0 – 0%-14% TBD population served (PRIMARY) OR TBD population of Zip Code where the project is located (SECONDARY).</u></p>



Scoring Criteria Update

D - CRITERIA for review/inclusion:

✓ County Facilities Planning (CFP) scoring component

- Bldg Mission Category (BMC) component would provide a scoring criteria to account for service, utilization, and long-term disposition.
- Staff from the Facilities Condition and Assessment section (FCA) of the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) have updated the BMCs and input the data into the County's VFA facility assessment system.

NOTE: FCA staff are continually working to enhance the BMC categories to make them as accurate as possible. In light of this, it is anticipated that FCA will present BMC updates for the CIC to consider for subsequent scoring modifications.
- Projects would be scored by County staff (from the CFP Steering Committee or CFP Steering Committee designee(s)) relative to the Criteria/Impact weights and alignment with CFP facilities planning, then included into the overall CIC scoring matrix.
 - Projects not recommended (or on HOLD) by CFP will have supporting information provided to CIC.



Scoring Criteria Update

D - Update Option

- Impact weights range from 0 to 5. (attachment #1 for BMC)



CRITERIA	IMPACT
<u>7.) Building Mission Category</u>	<u>5 – Project relates to a building mission 1 category</u> <u>3 – Project relates to a building mission 2 category</u> <u>1 – Project relates to a building mission 3 category</u> <u>0 – Not Recommended (or HOLD) by CFP/Project relates to a building mission 4 or 5 category</u>