



# DRAFT OBJECTIVES & PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA

## Ad Hoc Joint City-Schools Facility Investment Task Force

Draft: July 25, 2017 (for Joint Task Force review)

The Task Force desires to develop and apply a set of criteria that support a transparent project prioritization process and a best-value approach to the development of a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for FY2019 to FY2028.

To ensure a best value is reached, propose a three step evaluation process:

- **Need & Relative Urgency:** the first objective is to understand the nature of the proposed project and its relative need and sense of urgency.
- **Project Readiness:** the second objective is to understand the readiness for project implementation in the proposed time frame.
- **Value to Alexandria:** the third objective is to understand the value the project proposes to deliver in terms of supporting the City Strategic Plan and/or the ACPS 2020 Strategic Plan, planning priorities, and operational effectiveness.

In summary, the Task Force desires to employ systems thinking and evaluate the inter-relationship between the needs a project fulfills and the goals it advances, and to what extent, so that the resulting CIP provides a portfolio of projects optimizing funds for the best value.

Criteria	Description	Notes
<b>Step 1: Demonstration of Need &amp; Relative Urgency</b>		
<b>Life Safety / Critical Need</b>	The project is required to address health and safety improvements. When is the project identified as needing to occur? What is the consequence of not meeting that timeframe?	Primary/Secondary/Tertiary Urgent/Somewhat Urgent/Not Urgent Consequence of delay
<b>Required / Mandated Project</b>	The project is required to meet legal, compliance, or regulatory mandates. When is the project identified as needing to occur by? What is the consequence of not meeting that timeframe?	Primary/Secondary/Tertiary Urgent/Somewhat Urgent/Not Urgent Consequence of delay
<b>Facility Renewal</b>	The project extends the useful life of an existing asset (scope could include total renovation or reconstruction to replace asset in kind). What is the remaining useful life of the asset? What is the consequence of not addressing the need by that timeframe?	Primary/Secondary/Tertiary Urgent/Somewhat Urgent/Not Urgent Consequence of delay
<b>Functional Need / Expansion</b>	The project provides a solution to a functional need or future demand identified during planning activities (scope could include expansion or major alteration of the existing asset or new construction). When should the need or future demand be addressed? What is the consequence of not addressing the need by that timeframe?	Primary/Secondary/Tertiary Urgent/Somewhat Urgent/Not Urgent Consequence of delay
<b>Related to Other Project</b>	The project relates to another project and thus implementation needs to be considered together. Does the project need to precede or occur simultaneously with the related project? What is the consequence of not addressing the need by that timeframe?	Primary/Secondary/Tertiary Urgent/Somewhat Urgent/Not Urgent Consequence of delay

Each project will be identified according to category of need. Projects may align with multiple categories of need, thus it is suggested that projects be identified by their primary, secondary, and tertiary category.

The preferred timeframes for addressing the need(s) and the consequence of not implementing the project within that timeframe will also be identified during this step. It is proposed that projects be identified for one of three timeframes:

- Urgent (Years 1 – 3)
- Somewhat urgent (Years 4 – 6)
- Not urgent (Years 7 – 9)

A preliminary schedule of projects can be drafted to illustrate this information and each consequence can be rated on a scale of low, medium, and high to help support further decision making.

Criteria	Description	Notes
<b>Step 2: Demonstration of Project Readiness:</b>		
<b>Project Plan - Schedule</b>	Does the timeline for project implementation consider site identification, land acquisition (as appropriate), easements & other due diligence activities, public involvement, approvals, procurement, etc.?	Alignment w/ Step 1 timeframe: Yes / Somewhat / No
<b>Project Plan - Budget</b>	Does the project budget consider all categories of costs (hard, soft, contingencies, etc.), current market conditions, and future escalation? Was the project budget fully funded in the last CIP? Is there an update to costs needed to reflect new market conditions or new assumptions? If so, what?	Alignment w/ FY18-27 CIP: Yes / Somewhat / No Yes/No Yes/No Project Specific
<b>Project Plan - Scope &amp; Consideration of Alternatives</b>	Was the scope developed in alignment with existing zoning, standards, guidelines, and other industry best practices? Have alternative project scenarios such as location, scope, phasing, future adaptability, etc. been considered and evaluated?	Yes / Somewhat / No  Yes / Somewhat / No
Summary Evaluation: Ready / Somewhat ready / Not ready / Information to be learned over time		

Overall, the projects can be evaluated as ‘Ready’, ‘Somewhat ready’, ‘Not ready’, and ‘Information to be learned over time’ (for those projects identified for the later years of the CIP where conditions and assumptions are subject to change).

- Project plans will provide insight into the readiness of projects to be implemented.
- Schedule information will help to better understand the feasibility and logistical realities of completing a project in the timeframe (to ensure alignment with sense of urgency identified in step 1).
- Budget information will help substantiate the amount needed and any adjustments that may need to be need for additional time and to provide confidence that the budget will not be subject to major changes once initiated.
- Scope information will help substantiate that the project plan has considered appropriate guidelines and standards and evaluated alternatives to provide confidence that the scope will not be subject to major changes once initiated.

Following the review of the above information, the preliminary schedule of projects will be refined to reflect the logistical information learned about readiness.

Criteria	Description	Notes
<b>Demonstration of Value to Alexandria:</b>		
<b>Strategic Plan Alignment</b>	Is the project aligned with the themes from the City Strategic Plan and/or the ACPS 2020 Strategic Plan? If so, what theme(s) and to what extent?	Yes / Somewhat / No
<b>Planning Priority</b>	Does the project advance an identified priority from an adopted plan, study, or policy? If so, identify and explain.	Yes / Somewhat / No
<b>Operating Impact &amp; Efficiency</b>	Does the project seek to optimize its operating impact? If so, what is the impact and to what extent?	Yes / Somewhat / No
<b>Consequence of Delay or Inaction</b>	Is there a consequence of delaying or not implementing the project? If so, identify and explain.	Yes / Somewhat / No
<b>Other Citizen Impacts as Noted</b>	Does the project provide other benefits to Alexandria not captured above? Does the project have demonstrated and/or documented community support?	Yes / Somewhat / No

Lastly, projects will be reviewed to understand the goals a projects advances, and to what extent. In order to track and differentiate responses, each project will be coded on a scale of 1 to 5, with 'Yes' representing 5, 'Somewhat' representing 3, and 'No' representing 1. This framework will help to rate projects against each other and balance the preliminary schedule based on need, urgency, and readiness logistics to reflect relative value to Alexandria.

The following considerations were noted but are not included within the above criteria as they more directly relate to project identification and scoping. These considerations should be discussed by the appropriate sub-committees:

- During project development, identification of Alexandria's self-imposed limitations such as zoning and approvals that if removed or modified could positively impact a project's schedule, budget, and/or scope.
- Development or revision of design standards and guidelines that further promote the best value approach such as future adaptability and co-location considerations.
- Future adopted plans, studies, or policies should be written in a manner to clearly relate objectives and goals to the capital improvement program.
- During project development, identify opportunities for offsetting the capital budget with other financial or funding opportunities such as P3. Until agreements are finalized, full capital budget exposure to the City or Schools should be reflected in the CIP.