Preliminary Administrative Approval – same requirements as currently stated in board policy.

Formal Project Approval – If the University intends to solicit proposals for a contractor prior to requesting SDA, inform board of intention to use innovative procurement method (CM@R or other) at this step; if so stated, approval of FPA will mean BOR approval to solicit bids/proposals for the contractor. The University must still request authorization from the Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) to use CM@R. A Project Agreement must be executed and submitted with the FPA request.

Innovative Procurement RFP and Evaluation Committee –
- The Request for Proposals will be developed by the University and submitted along with a copy of the FPA (or SDA) to the Chief Procurement Officer for approval. The evaluation criteria will be balanced to ensure technical qualifications and cost of services are given appropriate weight to achieve best value for university.
- The evaluation committee will consist of a minimum of 5 voting members: the project or contract manager, 1-2 user representatives as appropriate, and two or more open seats for industry-related professionals which may not be filled by University Facilities staff (it is highly recommended to have one open seat filled by a professional outside the university system). This category may include facilities D&C staff working for other state or local agencies. Consideration will be given to eliminating high and low scores from final tally.
- The University Design and Construction Director is responsible for instructing the selection committee, and the Project Manager for preparing a Record of Evaluation/Selection (RE/S). The RE/S will document the process including final selection decision-making by the committee. Consideration should be given to the benefits of ranking proposals, rather than scoring them.
- The Record of Evaluation/Selection, including scoring sheets, will be approved by the University procurement officer and Facilities Director. If approved, inform the BOR Facilities and Land Management Committee of contractor selection in the next monthly construction-in-progress report.

Schematic Design Approval – Inform the board regarding intent to continue use of CM@R contractor and request permission to enter negotiation for GMP portion of CM@R contract, if appropriate. Any variance from the Project Agreement (PA) must be noted in an amendment executed by the original parties to the PA and submitted with the SDA request. Changes to the project scope, budget or schedule during design and construction document development must be reported to the Chief Facilities Officer (CFO). If required by BOR policy the CFO will submit the report to the appropriate board structure.

Pre-bid Report – Inform the CFO after GMP negotiations and prior to award of construction contract, regardless of whether or not there is any material change.
Pre-bid report shall describe salient points and outcomes of negotiations, noting any changes or impacts on project scope, quality of construction, schedule, budget, estimated annual operating costs, or modifications to building systems.

Award Report – same requirements as currently stated in board policy.

On-going project management – University will submit to the CPO and CFO the scope and cost details of any anticipated change orders which modify funding sources, Total Project Cost, or project scope. A change in scope is considered to be anything that increases or reduces square footage, increases or lessens NUSF for individual program(s), modifies building systems, adds or eliminates a component of the program, reduces expected life of materials or the building.

Construction-in-Progress reports – University will submit a report in accordance with approved format each month during the construction phase of the contract.

Final Report – same requirements as currently stated in board policy.
Procurement Delivery Method Selection

Project Risk: Cost Control, Budget, Schedule Delays, Quality

Complexity of Project: Highly Technical Design, One-of-a-kind Components, Legacy Construction, Precise Scheduling, Multiple Phases, Occupied Facility

Complexity Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>Owner Desires</th>
<th>Owner Willing to Accept Higher Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LSF</td>
<td>CMAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Owner Desires**
  - Lowest Risk

- **Owner Willing to Accept Higher Risk**
  - Design Build
  - Design Bid Build

**Power Plant/Utilities**
- Gen. Academic Lab
- Voc-Ed (Auto Shop)
- Dining Facility
- Library
- General Classroom
- Sports Complex
- Light Agriculture
- General Administration

**Engineering Labs**
- General Research Lab
- Concert Hall/Theatre
- Fire Station
- Student Union
- Liberal Arts
- Day Care
- Light Residential
- Storage Facilities

**BSL-2 and Higher Labs**
- Museums
- Super Computing Center
- Fire/EMS/Police Dispatch Center
- Intensive Agriculture
- Heavy Residential
- Logistical Buildings