

## How to Review the Draft Project Rankings (and other considerations)

- **Introductory Notes:**

- This is a DRAFT document only. It is shared with the intention to solicit feedback.
- Gordian is a consultancy that specializes in helping school districts assess their physical assets. Gordian’s “CORE” assessment of system score is based on a standard scoring system that they use throughout the country. It is a fairly objective starting point but a “top-down” approach. Therefore, a building or a system assessment may be modified after an in-progress “bottom-up” analysis based on extensive, detailed site inspections is complete (in April/May 2023). Although some changes are likely, it is not expected that there will be drastic changes in the assessments. This initial draft of project rankings therefore has been created and is shared for campus review and feedback. Additional information will be shared with the campuses when it is received and reviewed by Facilities Management.

- **Explanation of Columns:**

- Proposed Rank: This is the proposed priority ranking of projects.
  - Although this ranking does consider some known site logistics, it is understood that additional logistical requirements will arise as each project is designed. This could result in certain projects needing to be grouped together, re-ranked, and/or relocated. If such conditions arise, Facilities Management will aim to communicate this information effectively with the campuses and ensure that the campuses are fully included in the decision-making process.
- FSP #: This is a reference to the Facilities Strategic Plan (FSP) project groupings and/or project number. In some cases, groupings may have been broken down into sub-projects and individually numbered. This allows for them to be individually located in the accompanying campus map.
- Type:
  - Renovate: Upgrade systems, modernize, and/or reconstruct as necessary.
    - Note: As cost estimates for projected scope become available, it is sometimes necessary to reevaluate initial plans for an existing structure. A general industry rule-of-thumb is that if renovation costs exceed x % of the value of the structure, the recommendation is often to demo the structure and build new. In such cases, the campus will be fully included in a decision of renovate or “scrape & build.”
  - New: New building / structure.
  - Demo: Demolition of existing building and/or area.

## How to Review the Draft Project Rankings (and other considerations)

- Option-New / Option-Demo: This refers to Facilities Strategic Plans that show multiple options for a single proposed structure, and this designation refers to the option that is not proposed to be selected in the current ranking.
- Infra: Infrastructure project. Several infrastructure-related projects may be defined and shown in the project lists already. Others will be better defined as projects are designed and the impact on the infrastructure needs of the campuses evolve.
- Description: This is the building / area to be built, renovated, and/or demolished.
- Systems “CORE” Review:
  - This is an aggregate assessment of system scores for each structure.
  - Legend:
    - A10: Foundations
    - B20: Exterior Enclosure
    - B30: Roofing
    - C30: Interior Finishes
    - D20: Plumbing
    - D30: HVAC
    - D40: Fire Protection
    - D50: Electrical
    - E10: Equipment
- **General Guide to Prioritization of Projects**
  - Guiding Principles:
    - (1) Safety first.
    - (2) Facilities Strategic Plan goals (as basis of “mission critical” priorities)
    - (3) New buildings providing a new service to outweigh replacement or renovation of a building that provides a service already being provided.
    - (4) Buildings with “low” scores should generally rank low.
    - (5) Minimize swing-space construction. (Ideally, if a building is to be demolished and replaced, the replacement building is constructed prior to demolishing the existing building).
  - Other Considerations:
    - Infrastructure projects (e.g., “hidden” utility needs, or other supporting infrastructure *to be determined*). These will be better understood as project designs develop, but money will need to be set aside for these items.
    - Energy Projects (*to be determined*). The SDCCD Energy and Environment Plan is being developed currently and it is expected to make recommendations for

## How to Review the Draft Project Rankings (and other considerations)

energy/environment-related projects. The specifics of these projects, however, will evolve alongside the development of other projects. Money will need to be set aside for these.

- Although prioritization is an ordered process (informed by FSPs and Gordian’s data-driven analysis), the ranking process cannot be divorced from all subjectivity and/or legitimate exceptions to the rules.
- All stakeholders should understand that there will be limits on resources available, and that it is not anticipated that every project will be addressed by a possible 2024 bond. Therefore, all stakeholders are asked to be good “team players” so that we can work together to optimize the goals and mission of the greater District. This will be needed especially when campus project rankings are merged into the comprehensive (multi-campus) SDCCD project ranking.
- Next Steps
  - Feedback from campuses
  - Feedback from Gordian’s detailed site assessments
  - Feedback from Energy and Environment Plan (under development)
  - Costing of projects
  - Finalization of project rankings by campus
  - Merging of campus priorities into comprehensive SDCCD project rankings
  - Feedback / discussion / consensus building. (With this consensus, there needs to be a clear understanding that project needs, goals, and methodologies will likely change over the next 10-20 years. The ability to adapt to these changes will need to be built into the ballot text language.)
  - Cabinet and Board approvals of SDCCD project rankings
  - Separately, outside groups can help determine amount of bond money to be asked for of the voter. This amount will then be projected onto to the District-wide ranked projects (and their expected costs), providing stakeholder with a general sense of which projects would and would not likely be constructed if a 2024 bond were to pass.