



Skanska USA Building Inc.
221 Yale Ave N. Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98109
Phone 206-726-8000
Fax 206-328-9235
Web www.skanskausa.com

February 20, 2015

Brigham Young University, Idaho

Project: ASC 2015- Sustainable Building & LEED Problem Statement

Subject: Final Scoring Detail

Dear Chris,

Congratulations on competing in the ASC 2015 Sustainable Building & LEED Problem Statement, I hope you found the experience both educational and enjoyable. We understand how much effort goes into preparing for the competition every year and to your credit the level of preparation showed, the judges were extremely impressed with the level of competition this year:

<u>Team</u>	<u>Score</u>
University of Florida	78.08
Colorado State University	76.40
University of Washington	71.80
University of New Mexico	63.51

Attached is a scoring summary sheet detailing how well your team performed on: the prequalification, each of the five problems and the addendum. The median and average scores of each problem are given for comparison. The total median and average scores for the written portion of the problem statement are shown at the top of the sheet along with your team's total score. In the upper right of the sheet your team's rank against the other competitors is shown for both the written and oral portions of the competition. The last pages detail a breakdown of how the judges scored your team on each written problem.

The Skanska problem statement team enjoyed the competition this year and we hope to see you all back for next year's event. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me at Anthony.spinelli@skanska.com.

Very Truly,

Anthony J. Spinelli

Anthony J. Spinelli
Project Manager

Skanska USA Building
www.skanska.com
Phone +1 206 726 8000
Mobile +1 206 406 2361
Fax +1 866 457 5286

cc: ASC 2015 Problem Scoring

	Median Score	Average Score	BYU - Idaho
83 Totals	50.95	48.30	49.40

Prequalification

5

Number of AP on Team
Format
Sustainable Thoughts
Green Achievements
Page Count

Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	BYU - Idaho
1			0.00
1			1.00
1			0.25
1			0.00
1			1.00
Prequalification Totals	3.25	3.13	2.25

Rank Against Other Teams

Written Response:	Middle Third
Oral Presentation:	Bottom Third
Overall Score:	Middle Third

LEED Credit Comparison

10

Overall Project Review
Materials Category
Recommendation of Rating System

Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	BYU - Idaho
3			1.15
2			2.00
5			3.00
LEED Credit Comparison	4.45	4.86	6.15

On-Site Renewable

20

Solar Panel Design
Additional Renewable
Alternate Energy Sources

Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	BYU - Idaho
12			6.00
6			6.00
2			2.00
On-Site Renewable	14.00	13.03	14.00

Life Cycle Analysis

15

Annual Energy Use
Life Cycle Analysis
Subcontractor Selection
Incentives & Rebates
Fixture Recommendation

Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	BYU - Idaho
2			1.50
6.5			4.00
2			2.00
3.5			1.50
1			1.00
Life Cycle Analysis	10.00	9.50	10.00

Carbon Footprint

15

Bid Comparison
Local vs. Out of Town

Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	BYU - Idaho
10			5.50
5			5.00
Carbon Footprint	10.50	9.17	10.50

Water Collection and Use

15

Irrigation Consumption
Rain Water Collection
Cistern

Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	BYU - Idaho
6			0.50
6			2.00
3			1.50
Water Collection and Use	6.75	7.08	4.00

Addendum

3

Bonus Questions - Estimated Ridership 64000
Bonus Questions - Gallons Saved 11000 (27000)
Bonus Questions - Improve Ridership
Formatting
Exceeded Page Count

Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	BYU - Idaho
1			1.00
1			0.50
1			1.00
-5			-
-10			-
Addendum Totals	2.00	1.53	2.50

Problem #1 - LEED 2009 vs. LEED v4 Assessment

BRINGHAM YOUNG
UNIVERSITY, IDAHO

10 Total Points Possible

10 Total Points Possible		
PART 1: Overall Project Review	3 Pts Possible	1.15
SS - 2009	0.2	0.05
WE - 2009	0.2	0.2
EA - 2009	0.2	0.15
MR - 2009	0.2	0.15
IEQ - 2009	0.2	0.1
IDP - 2009	0.2	0
RPC - 2009	0.2	0
LT - v4	0.2	0.1
SS - v4	0.2	0.2
WE - v4	0.2	0.05
EA - v4	0.2	0.05
MR - v4	0.2	0
IEQ - v4	0.2	0.1
Innovation - v4	0.2	0
RP - v4	0.2	0
Comments		
PART 2: Materials Category	2 Pts Possible	2
Credits of the future: do they mention all 3 credits and fully describe what each entails?	1	1
Did they research what needs to happen to accomplish credits of the future (EPDs, 3rd party certified products, "USGBC approved program")	0.25	0.25
Mention of MR credits being combined	0.75	0.75
Comments		great, mentioned how the new requirements are not yet possible
PART 3: Recommendation of Rating System	5 Pts Possible	3
Two or More Innovative Ideas	2	1
Are the innovative ideas realistic/attainable?	1	0.5
Were the innovative ideas explained well, easily understood?	1	1
Convincing	1	0.5
Comments		

15 Total Points Possible

BYU

Problem # 2 - Life Cycle Sustainability Analysis - Lighting		
#1.a Correct light fixture take-off QTY	1	0.5
#1.b Use correct LA County power/cost formula (22.3)	0.5	0.5
#1.c Answer	0.5	0.5
#2.a Complete detailed life cycle analysis	3	2
#2.b Identify criteria and formula used	3	1.5
#2.c Organization of answer/data	0.5	0.5
#3.a Select correct subcontractor	2	2
#4.a Quality of incentives/rebates (1 pt ea. - max of 3)	3	1
#4.b Organization of answer/findings	0.5	0.5
#5.a Correct selection of light fixture	1	1
	15	10

Question 2- good walkthru of the question, but no formula provided

Payoff was wrong but they want LED's for Green Council.

15 Total
Points
Possible

BYU Idaho

Problem #3 - 4th St. Station Carbon Footprint			
Part I #1	Takeoff of Concrete CY	1.5	1
Part I #2	Bid comparison / least expensive	2.5	1.5
Part I #3	Carbon Footprint of each supplier / lowest	4	2.5
Part I #4	Best value supplier	2	0.5
Part II #1	Carbon footprint of crew	2	2
Part II #2	Carbon footprint of crew - local	1.5	1.5
Part II #3	Carbon footprint of crew - carpool	1.5	1.5
Total		15	10.5

Notes

Pt I # 1 - did not include 7% waste

Pt I # 2 - math error in sales tax amount

Pt I # 3 - did not show enough calcs or assumptions to support answer

Pt I # 4 - did not state answer

15 Total Points Possible

BYU Idaho

Problem #4 - Water Usage and Collection		
#1. a) Forumula	2	0
#1 b) ET_o	1	0
#1.c) Landscaped Areas	1	0.5
#1.d) Answer	1	0
#1.e) Organization	1	0
#2.a) Rainfall data by month	1	0
#2.b) Rainwater Collection Formula	1.5	1
#2.c) Collection Area	1.5	1
#2.d) Answer - Size of Cistern	1	0
#2.e) Organization	1	0
#3.a) Volume Calculation	0.5	0.5
#3.c) Graph/Method	1.5	0.5
#3.a) Answer & Organization	1	0.5

15

4

missing landscape areas

no equations or assumptions for part 1

Didn't analyze water usage/collection by month

didn't use collection factor

never provided a volume of cistern

20 Total Points Possible

BYU

Problem #5 - Onsite Renewable Energy			
#1.a	Correct quantities	2	1
	Work is shown, correct equation is used	2	1
	Marked up drawing is accurate and realistic	1	0.5
#1.b	Work is shown and is correct	1	0.5
	Acknowledged factors other than initial cost	1	0
	Narrative is clear and illustrates the rationale	2	1
#1.c	i. Correct direction	1	1
	ii. Correct angle	1	0
	iii. Correct dates	0.5	0.5
	iii. Correct angles	0.5	0.5
#2a.	Product chosen, with cost and quantity	2	2
#2.b.	cost of panel support structure	1	1
#2.c	payback period, and cost assumptions	2	2
#2.d	Projected cost of maintenance	1	1
#3.a	Response is clear, concise, and realistic	0.5	0.5
#3.b	Response is clear, concise, and realistic	0.5	0.5
#3.c	Response is clear, concise, and realistic	0.5	0.5
#3.d	Response is clear, concise, and realistic	0.5	0.5

No work shown
Does not account for the mechanical equipment on the roof

Good detail

20

14