



Oconee County, South Carolina Capital Project Advisory Committee Project Scoring Sheet

Project: Shell Building
 Sponsor: Economic Development
 Date Submitted: 9/28/2011 Date Scored: 10/16/2011

| Reviewer | Public Health, Safety, and Mandates 30% | Goals Established in Adopted Plans 20% | Economic Development 20% | Budgetary Impact 20% | Impact on Service Levels and Relationship to Other Projects 10% |
|--------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| County Council Rep | 0.0 | 40.0 | 37.0 | 73.0 | 60.0 |
| County Administrator | 0.0 | 31.0 | 33.0 | 72.0 | 45.0 |
| Infrastructure Adv. Rep. | 4.0 | 22.0 | 30.0 | 74.0 | 47.0 |
| At-Large 1 (JR) | 0.0 | 28.0 | 33.0 | 49.0 | 5.0 |
| At-Large 2 (DM) | 3.0 | 36.0 | 35.0 | 48.0 | 54.0 |
| Total Score | 7.0 | 157.0 | 168.0 | 316.0 | 211.0 |
| Average Score | 1.4 | 31.4 | 33.6 | 63.2 | 42.2 |

| Group Score Calculation | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|
| Criteria | Number of Considerations | Weighted Score |
| Public Health, Safety, and Mandates | 2 | 2.1 |
| Goals Established in Adopted Plans | 4 | 15.7 |
| Economic Development | 4 | 16.8 |
| Budgetary Impact | 9 | 14.0 |
| Impact on Service Levels and Relationship to Other Projects | 8 | 5.3 |
| Total Project Score (Out of Possible 100) | | 53.9 |



ACT

Oconee County, South Carolina Capital Project Advisory Committee Reviewer's Scoring Sheet

"Scoring Test"

Project Description/Name: OCCP 5 HELL BLDG.

CPAC Reviewer's Name: Paul Corbett Date Scored: 11/7/11 Project Score: 36.0

Instructions: Evaluate each statement listed in the Considerations column in terms of applicability to the proposed project. Score each consideration between 0 and 10, with 0 indicating the consideration is definitely False, and 10 indicating the stated consideration is definitely True. Scores between 0 and 10 indicate varying degrees of probability that the statement is true or false, with 5 indicating there is an equal chance the statement is either true or false.

| Criteria | Considerations | Score (0-10) | Total Criteria Score |
|--|---|--------------|----------------------|
| Public Health, Safety and Mandates- 30% of Score | Project directly addresses a health and/or safety need | 0 | 0 x 30% = 0 |
| | Project directly addresses a regulatory mandate | 0 | |
| Goals Established in Adopted Plans- 20% of Score | Project helps implement goals established in the Comprehensive Plan | 10 | 40 x .2 = 8 |
| | Project is consistent with adopted strategic plans | 10 | |
| | Project implements some or all recommendations of a previous study | 10 | |
| | Project has been consistently included in previous Capital Improvement Programs (CIP's) | 10 | |
| Economic Development- 20% of Score | Project will facilitate production of jobs | 10 | 37 x .2 = 7.4 |
| | Project will facilitate development that directly enhances revenues | 10 | |
| | Project will enhance County's image, thereby attracting potential investors | 10 | |
| | Project will help prevent jobs/revenue leakage from the county | 7 | |

| Criteria | Considerations | Score (0-10) | Total Criteria Score |
|--|---|------------------|----------------------|
| Budgetary Impact- 20% of Score | Project will have positive impact on General Fund budget | LT 10 | 73 x 2 = 146 |
| | Project will facilitate acquisition of grants and other outside funding | (etc) 10 | |
| | Project will be economically sustainable | 10 | |
| | Project is supported by available or previously designated funding | 10 | |
| | Project construction/acquisition now will result in significant savings or economies of scale | 3 | |
| | Project will have a positive impact on operation and maintenance budgets | ↑ Tx Lower 10 | |
| | Project will improve efficiency of existing operations | 0 | |
| | Project will be low-maintenance | 10 | |
| | Project can be supported by existing resources (staff, funding, etc.) | 10 | |
| Impact on Service Levels and Relationship to Other Projects- 10% of Score | Project will bring service up to desired level | 0 | 60 x .1 = 6 |
| | Project will improve service levels of other assets or functions. | 0 | |
| | Project coordinates well with other projects either ongoing or approved for near future | 10 | |
| | Project can be effectively coordinated with other projects in same area | 10 | |
| | Project will benefit other jurisdictions | Maintenance 10 | |
| | Project is timely or is subject to a window of opportunity | 10 | |
| | Project is planned to create minimal disruption and inconvenience to the public | 10 | |
| | Project is ranked as best use of funding for category of project | 10 | |



Oconee County, South Carolina

Capital Project Advisory Committee

Reviewer's Scoring Sheet

Project Description/Name: SHERI BUILDING

CPAC Reviewer's Name: SCOTT MOULDER Date Scored: 11/15/11 Project Score: _____

Instructions: Evaluate each stated consideration listed in Column 2 in terms of applicability to the proposed project. Score each consideration between 0 and 10, with 0 indicating the consideration is definitely False, and 10 indicating the stated consideration is definitely True. Scores between 0 and 10 indicate varying degrees of probability that the statement is true or false, with 5 indicating there is an equal chance the statement is either true or false.

| Criteria | Considerations | Score (0-10) | Total Criteria Score |
|--|---|--------------|----------------------|
| Public Health, Safety and Mandates- 30% of Score | Project directly addresses a health and/or safety need | 0 | 0 |
| | Project directly addresses a regulatory mandate | 0 | |
| Goals Established in Adopted Plans- 20% of Score | Project helps implement goals established in the Comprehensive Plan | 7 | 31 |
| | Project is consistent with adopted strategic plans | 9 | |
| | Project implements some or all recommendations of a previous study | 9 | |
| | Project has been consistently included in previous Capital Improvement Programs (CIP's) | 6 | |
| Economic Development- 20% of Score | Project will facilitate production of jobs | 10 | 33 |
| | Project will facilitate development that directly enhances revenues | 10 | |
| | Project will enhance County's image, thereby attracting potential investors | 8 | |
| | Project will help prevent jobs/revenue leakage from the county | 5 | |

| Criteria | Considerations | Score (0-10) | Total Criteria Score |
|--|---|--------------|----------------------|
| Budgetary Impact- 20% of Score | Project will have positive impact on General Fund budget | 10 | 72 |
| | Project will facilitate acquisition of grants and other outside funding | 10 | |
| | Project will be economically sustainable | 10 | |
| | Project is supported by available or previously designated funding | 10 | |
| | Project construction/acquisition now will result in significant savings or economies of scale | 10 | |
| | Project will have a positive impact on operation and maintenance budgets | 1 | |
| | Project will improve efficiency of existing operations | 1 | |
| | Project will be low-maintenance | 10 | |
| | Project can be supported by existing resources (staff, funding, etc.) | 10 | |
| Impact on Service Levels and Relationship to Other Projects- 10% of Score | Project will bring service up to desired level | 4 | 45 |
| | Project will improve service levels of other assets or functions | 0 | |
| | Project coordinates well with other projects either ongoing or approved for near future | 4 | |
| | Project can be effectively coordinated with other projects in same area | 4 | |
| | Project will benefit other jurisdictions | 10 | |
| | Project is timely or is subject to a window of opportunity | 8 | |
| | Project is planned to create minimal disruption and inconvenience to the public | 10 | |
| | Project is ranked as best use of funding for category of project | 5 | |



Oconee County, South Carolina

Capital Project Advisory Committee

Reviewer's Scoring Sheet

Project Description/Name: Bobby Williams

CPAC Reviewer's Name: Bobby Williams Date Scored: _____ Project Score: _____

Instructions: Evaluate each statement listed in the Considerations column in terms of applicability to the proposed project. Score each consideration between 0 and 10, with 0 indicating the consideration is definitely False, and 10 indicating the stated consideration is definitely True. Scores between 0 and 10 indicate varying degrees of probability that the statement is true or false, with 5 indicating there is an equal chance the statement is either true or false.

| Criteria | Considerations | Score (0-10) | Total Criteria Score |
|--|---|--------------|----------------------|
| Public Health, Safety and Mandates- 30% of Score | Project directly addresses a health and/or safety need | 2 | 4 |
| | Project directly addresses a regulatory mandate | 2 | |
| Goals Established in Adopted Plans- 20% of Score | Project helps implement goals established in the Comprehensive Plan | 3 | 22 |
| | Project is consistent with adopted strategic plans | 7 | |
| | Project implements some or all recommendations of a previous study | 7 | |
| | Project has been consistently included in previous Capital Improvement Programs (CIP's) | 5 | |
| Economic Development- 20% of Score | Project will facilitate production of jobs | 7 | 30 |
| | Project will facilitate development that directly enhances revenues | 7 | |
| | Project will enhance County's image, thereby attracting potential investors | 8 | |
| | Project will help prevent jobs/revenue leakage from the county | 8 | |

| Criteria | Considerations | Score (0-10) | Total Criteria Score |
|--|---|--------------|----------------------|
| Budgetary Impact- 20% of Score | Project will have positive impact on General Fund budget | 8 | 74 |
| | Project will facilitate acquisition of grants and other outside funding | 10 | |
| | Project will be economically sustainable | 10 | |
| | Project is supported by available or previously designated funding | 5 | |
| | Project construction/acquisition now will result in significant savings or economies of scale | 8 | |
| | Project will have a positive impact on operation and maintenance budgets | 8 | |
| | Project will improve efficiency of existing operations | 7 | |
| | Project will be low-maintenance | 9 | |
| | Project can be supported by existing resources (staff, funding, etc.) | 9 | |
| Impact on Service Levels and Relationship to Other Projects- 10% of Score | Project will bring service up to desired level | 5 | 47 |
| | Project will improve service levels of other assets or functions | 7 | |
| | Project coordinates well with other projects either ongoing or approved for near future | 3 | |
| | Project can be effectively coordinated with other projects in same area | 8 | |
| | Project will benefit other jurisdictions | 8 | |
| | Project is timely or is subject to a window of opportunity | 8 | |
| | Project is planned to create minimal disruption and inconvenience to the public | 3 | |
| | Project is ranked as best use of funding for category of project | 5 | |



Oconee County, South Carolina

Capital Project Advisory Committee

Reviewer's Scoring Sheet

Project Description/Name: 2019 SHOLL # RETENTION FUND OCCO on Hwy 11

CPAC Reviewer's Name: RAU Date Scored: _____ Project Score: _____

Instructions: Evaluate each statement listed in the Considerations column in terms of applicability to the proposed project. Score each consideration between 0 and 10, with 0 indicating the consideration is definitely False, and 10 indicating the stated consideration is definitely True. Scores between 0 and 10 indicate varying degrees of probability that the statement is true or false, with 5 indicating there is an equal chance the statement is either true or false.

| Criteria | Considerations | Score (0-10) | Total Criteria Score |
|--|---|--------------|----------------------|
| Public Health, Safety and Mandates- 30% of Score | Project directly addresses a health and/or safety need | 0 | 0 |
| | Project directly addresses a regulatory mandate | 0 | |
| Goals Established in Adopted Plans- 20% of Score | Project helps implement goals established in the Comprehensive Plan | 9 | 33 |
| | Project is consistent with adopted strategic plans | 9 | |
| | Project implements some or all recommendations of a previous study | 10 | |
| | Project has been consistently included in previous Capital Improvement Programs (CIP's) | 10 | |
| Economic Development- 20% of Score | Project will facilitate production of jobs | 7 | 33 |
| | Project will facilitate development that directly enhances revenues | 10 | |
| | Project will enhance County's image, thereby attracting potential investors | 8 | |
| | Project will help prevent jobs/revenue leakage from the county | 8 | |

| Criteria | Considerations | Score (0-10) | Total Criteria Score |
|--|---|--------------|----------------------|
| Budgetary Impact- 20% of Score | Project will have positive impact on General Fund budget | 10 | 49 |
| | Project will facilitate acquisition of grants and other outside funding | 7 | |
| | Project will be economically sustainable | 8 | |
| | Project is supported by available or previously designated funding | 8 | |
| | Project construction/acquisition now will result in significant savings or economies of scale | 5/10? 10 | |
| | Project will have a positive impact on operation and maintenance budgets | 0 | |
| | Project will improve efficiency of existing operations | 0 | |
| | Project will be low-maintenance | 0 | |
| | Project can be supported by existing resources (staff, funding, etc.) | 10 | |
| Impact on Service Levels and Relationship to Other Projects- 10% of Score | Project will bring service up to desired level | 0 | 5 |
| | Project will improve service levels of other assets or functions | 0 | |
| | Project coordinates well with other projects either ongoing or approved for near future | 0 | |
| | Project can be effectively coordinated with other projects in same area <i>Physical?</i> | 0 | |
| | Project will benefit other jurisdictions | 0 | |
| | Project is timely or is subject to a window of opportunity | 0 | |
| | Project is planned to create minimal disruption and inconvenience to the public | 0 | |
| Project is ranked as best use of funding for category of project | 5 | | |

24.5



Oconee County, South Carolina

Capital Project Advisory Committee

Reviewer's Scoring Sheet

Project Description/Name: SHELL BLDG.

CPAC Reviewer's Name: D. MEAD Date Scored: 11-14-11 Project Score: 94

Instructions: Evaluate each stated consideration listed in Column 2 in terms of applicability to the proposed project. Score each consideration between 0 and 10, with 0 indicating the consideration is definitely False, and 10 indicating the stated consideration is definitely True. Scores between 0 and 10 indicate varying degrees of probability that the statement is true or false, with 5 indicating there is an equal chance the statement is either true or false.

| Criteria | Considerations | Score (0-10) | Total Criteria Score |
|--|---|--------------|----------------------|
| Public Health, Safety and Mandates- 30% of Score | Project directly addresses a health and/or safety need | 2 | 3 |
| | Project directly addresses a regulatory mandate | 1 | |
| Goals Established in Adopted Plans- 20% of Score | Project helps implement goals established in the Comprehensive Plan | 10 | 30 |
| | Project is consistent with adopted strategic plans | 8 | |
| | Project implements some or all recommendations of a previous study | 8 | |
| | Project has been consistently included in previous Capital Improvement Programs (CIP's) | 10 | |
| Economic Development- 20% of Score | Project will facilitate production of jobs | 10 | 35 |
| | Project will facilitate development that directly enhances revenues | 8 | |
| | Project will enhance County's image, thereby attracting potential investors | 3 | |
| | Project will help prevent jobs/revenue leakage from the county | 9 | |

| Criteria | Considerations | Score (0-10) | Total Criteria Score |
|--|---|--------------|----------------------|
| Budgetary Impact- 20% of Score | Project will have positive impact on General Fund budget | 0 | 48 |
| | Project will facilitate acquisition of grants and other outside funding | 5 | |
| | Project will be economically sustainable | 7 | |
| | Project is supported by available or previously designated funding | 8 | |
| | Project construction/acquisition now will result in significant savings or economies of scale | 8 | |
| | Project will have a positive impact on operation and maintenance budgets | 2 | |
| | Project will improve efficiency of existing operations | 8 | |
| | Project will be low-maintenance | 9 | |
| | Project can be supported by existing resources (staff, funding, etc.) | 1 | |
| Impact on Service Levels and Relationship to Other Projects- 10% of Score | Project will bring service up to desired level | 9 | 54 |
| | Project will improve service levels of other assets or functions | 2 | |
| | Project coordinates well with other projects either ongoing or approved for near future | 7 | |
| | Project can be effectively coordinated with other projects in same area | 7 | |
| | Project will benefit other jurisdictions | 5 | |
| | Project is timely or is subject to a window of opportunity | 9 | |
| | Project is planned to create minimal disruption and inconvenience to the public | 7 | |
| | Project is ranked as best use of funding for category of project | 8 | |

Oconee County, South Carolina
 Capital Project Advisory Committee
Listing of Projects by Priority

| Department Name | CPAC Priority Ranking | Description | Request | Priority Totals |
|------------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------|-----------------|
| High Falls | H | Campsite Renovations (water,electric,rebuid) | \$ 300,000 | |
| Facilities Maintenance | H | Brown Building - up-fit into office space | \$ 750,000 | |
| Solid Waste | H | Expand 2nd Busiest MCC | \$ 850,000 | |
| Rock Quarry | H | Upgrade Crushing Plant | \$ 1,000,000 | |
| Economic Development | H | Echo Hills Infrastructure | \$ 5,000,000 | |
| Economic Development | H | Sewer Line to Conross I-85 & GCCP | \$ 8,000,000 | |
| Library | H | Seneca Branch | \$ 9,100,000 | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| South Cove | M | Construct new Office | \$ 200,000 | |
| Rock Quarry | M | Land for Rock Quarry | \$ 550,000 | |
| Library | M | Renovate Interior of Walhalla Library | \$ 600,000 | |
| Economic Development | M | Golden Corner Commerce Park | \$ 3,500,000 | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|---------------|--|---------------|
| Sheriff | L | Shoot house for Firearms Training | \$ 315,000 | | |
| Economic Development | L | Exit 1 Business Development | \$ 500,000 | | |
| Sheriff | L | Driving Range for Training (cost could be spread out over several years) | \$ 750,000 | | |
| Solid Waste | L | Landfill Expansion Seneca C&D 1 | \$ 750,000 | | |
| Library | L | Westminster Library Expansion | \$ 1,000,000 | | |
| Economic Development | L | Extend Commerce Way to Armstrong Road | \$ 1,200,000 | | |
| Economic Development | L | Land for Oconee County Commerce Center | \$ 1,500,000 | | |
| Economic Development | L | Revolving Shell Building | \$ 2,000,000 | | |
| Library | L | 7,400 SF South County Library | \$ 2,000,000 | | |
| Economic Development | L | Exit 3 Development & Construction | \$ 5,000,000 | | \$ 15,015,000 |
| | | | \$ 44,865,000 | | |

From: John Rau

The flow chart was created to show the interrelationships of functions and times between the provision of project information to the Capital Improvement Program committee and those activities the committee will exercise to understand and score each project on its merits as detailed in documentation provided by county administration and will result in a formal input to the planning commission for further consideration and recommendations to County Council.

The detailed project information will, in most cases, have been in various phases during several planning and budgeting cycles to be considered for approval and implementation. This statement is included to give proper and significant recognition to all people, organizations and their labors to bring a project to reality through the various long and arduous procedural steps.

A policies and procedures list dated 10-13-2011 containing eight major elements and thirty sub-elements was considered by a group of four members of the committee and resulted in the flow chart. Many of the topics addressed normal and usual operations within the administrative process of creating documents, preparation by organizations, transmission of information, release of information and handling, security and storage of resulting documentation. Those sub-elements are inherent in usual and normal operations. They are essentially considered through the identity of who will do each of these sub-elements which are inherent in the functional blocks shown.

The most significant points made by the sub-committee was with regard to the attendance at the formal presentations, the time frame between presentations and the actual scoring data/mathematics and the further developing of information during voting membership appraisal period before scoring.

Attendance: If a voting member must be absent during the formal presentation, it was suggested that the presentation be done in council chambers and be recorded for mandatory review by the absent voting member(s) before the formal scoring and within the 5 day span set for the duration between presentation and scoring.

Time frame: The five day window between presentation and scoring (while somewhat arbitrary) allows for questions before scoring, gives time for individuals to score the project and get their results to the Finance Director for compilation before the formal scoring ratification meeting one week following the presentation.

Oconee County Capital Project Advisory Committee

Project Presentation Flowchart

