

**COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE  
INTEROFFICE COMMUNICATION**

**Date:** August 16, 2019

**To:** Kelly Bablitch, Chief of Staff, County Board of Supervisors

**From:** Capital Improvements Committee; Sub-Committee

**Subject:** Capital Improvement Committee Grading Columns Explanation

---

The following report provides information regarding the project “grading” columns presented as part of the Capital Improvement Committee’s (CIC) annual capital project request scoring report.

Pursuant to the CIC scoring matrix parameters, projects receive a base score determined by nine categories. Scores run highest (A1) to lowest (F3) using these base scores. However, the base score for “Contracted, Mandated, and/or Continuing” projects automatically receive the highest score possible (A1) due to the nature of those types of projects. This is the original “A-F Grading” (green highlighted) that was used/displayed as part of the 2015-2016 CIC scoring reports.

<u>REQ DEPT</u>	<u>DEPT RANK</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Mandated</u>	<u>Contractual</u>	<u>Continuing</u>	<u>2020 County Financing</u>	<u>Cash/Bond Financing</u>	<u>A-F Grading</u>
DOT-TRNS SRV	3	WH11601	S 76th St Bridge B-40-0573 (NB) over Loomis Rd		YES		\$80,540	BOND	A1

Beginning with the 2017 CIC scoring process review, the CIC requested another “grading” column be added so that members could see the base score of “Contracted, Mandated, and/or Continuing” projects as well. This is reflected in the “A-F ADJ Grading” (purple highlighted) as used/displayed in the 2017 process through present.

<u>REQ DEPT</u>	<u>DEPT RANK</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Mandated</u>	<u>Contractual</u>	<u>Continuing</u>	<u>2020 County Financing</u>	<u>Cash/Bond Financing</u>	<u>A-F ADJ Grading</u>	<u>A-F Grading</u>
DOT-TRNS SRV	3	WH11601	S 76th St Bridge B-40-0573 (NB) over Loomis Rd		YES		\$80,540	BOND	C2	A1

As part of the 2020 process, the CIC requested a grading modification column to reflect any change in scoring if the County Facilities Planning Steering Committee’s (CFPSC) “Not Recommended” or “Hold” projects were awarded Building Mission Category (BMC)

points.<sup>1</sup> In an effort to accommodate this request while trying to maintain a familiar format and mitigate confusion, the original (“Orig”) green and purple columns each include a second new column indicated as “ADJ” to account for the modification.

ADJ column added in 2020 per CIC request to reflect BMC Points regardless of CFPSC recommendation

	Orig	Adj	Orig	Adj						
Cash/Bond Financing	A-F ADJ Grading	A-F ADJ Grading	A-F Grading	A-F Grading	Sub-Project Continues into Out-Years?	2021	2022	2023	2024	Total Out-Year Costs

In relation to the CIC’s BMC modification request, the CIC asked that projects designated as “Not Recommended” or “Hold” by the CFPSC be specifically identified in the report as well. To accomplish this, a new “CFP REC” column was added to the scoring report reflecting the CFPSC scoring recommendation. The “Hold” and Not Recommended” projects are highlighted in black. Dashed lines were then added to specific projects if a change in the overall base score resulted from the inclusion of BMC points.

Item #	CFP REC	REQ DEPT	DEPT RANK	Project Number	Project Name	Mandated	Contractual	Continuing	2020 County Financing	Cash/Bond Financing	Orig	Adj	Orig	Adj
											A-F ADJ Grading	A-F ADJ Grading	A-F Grading	A-F Grading
9	Not Recommended	PARKS	22	WP20301	Kosciuszko Community Center HVAC			YES	\$2,316,919	BOND	C2	C1	A1	A1

The report includes a small legend on the upper left-hand side of the header. This is to assist the reader in determining the projects that were designated as “Hold” or “Not Recommended” by the CFPSC and if the project base score changed when BMC points were included.

### Capital Improvements Committee; Sub-Committee

<sup>1</sup> As part of the updated 2020 CIC scoring criteria, projects that received a “Hold” or “Not Recommended” score from the CFPSC are not awarded BMC points.

From July 17, 2019 CFPSC report to the CIC:

“Pertaining to the review of 2020 capital requests, the CFPSC has recommended approval of projects that are in alignment with the most current strategic or facility planning effort of the County. For example, the Parks Department has submitted two related capital requests for the Kosciuszko Community Center. The first capital request is a planning effort of approximately \$200,000 to comprehensively assess the condition of, survey services offered to ensure that community needs are met, and to plan for a facility that best meets these needs. The second capital request is for the replacement of the existing HVAC infrastructure, estimated at over \$2,000,000. The planning effort has been designated in the CFPSC analysis as “Recommend”, while the HVAC project has been designated as “Not Recommended”, because the Parks Department has established that this is the preferred strategic path forward for the facility. The HVAC project still exists on the capital list because it is a needed improvement absent a new planning effort. The same logic applies to the BHD requests as a new facility is anticipated and investments in the existing facility are not advised given the pending closure. The CFPSC designation to “Hold” a capital request suggests the need for further refinement of a project or discussion in order for the CFPSC to adequately review the request.”