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

California State University, Long Beach

Project: ASC 2015- Sustainable Building & LEED Problem Statement

Subject: Final Scoring Detail

Dear Jose,

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:

Team	Score
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	Cal State - LB
83	Totals	50.95	48.30	34.60

Prequalification 5

	Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	Cal State - LB
Number of AP on Team	1			0.75
Format	1			0.50
Sustainable Thoughts	1			1.00
Green Achievements	1			0.50
Page Count	1			1.00
Prequalification Totals		3.25	3.13	3.75

Rank Against Other Teams

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

LEED Credit Comparison 10

	Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	Cal State - LB
Overall Project Review	3			1.80
Materials Category	2			2.00
Recommendation of Rating System	5			0.05
LEED Credit Comparison		4.45	4.86	3.85

On-Site Renewable 20

	Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	Cal State - LB
Solar Panel Design	12			4.50
Additional Renewable	6			2.00
Alternate Energy Sources	2			0.25
On-Site Renewable		14.00	13.03	6.75

Life Cycle Analysis 15

	Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	Cal State - LB
Annual Energy Use	2			2.00
Life Cycle Analysis	6.5			2.50
Subcontractor Selection	2			-
Incentives & Rebates	3.5			1.00
Fixture Recommendation	1			-
Life Cycle Analysis		10.00	9.50	5.50

Carbon Footprint 15

	Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	Cal State - LB
Bid Comparison	10			2.50
Local vs. Out of Town	5			3.50
Carbon Footprint		10.50	9.17	6.00

Water Collection and Use 15

	Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	Cal State - LB
Irrigation Consumption	6			3.50
Rain Water Collection	6			1.50
Cistern	3			1.75
Water Collection and Use		6.75	7.08	6.75

Addendum 3

	Maximum Possible	Median Score	Average Score	Cal State - LB
Bonus Questions - Estimated Ridership 64000	1			1.00
Bonus Questions - Gallons Saved 11000 (27000)	1			0.50
Bonus Questions - Improve Ridership	1			0.50
Formatting	-5			
Exceeded Page Count	-10			-
Addendum Totals		2.00	1.53	2.00

Problem #1 - LEED 2009 vs. LEED v4 Assesment

10 Total Points Possible		CAL STATE, LONG BEACH
PART 1: Overall Project Review	3 Pts Possible	1.8
SS - 2009	0.2	0.1
WE - 2009	0.2	0.15
EA - 2009	0.2	0.15
MR - 2009	0.2	0.2
IEQ - 2009	0.2	0
IDP - 2009	0.2	0.1
RPC - 2009	0.2	0
LT - v4	0.2	0.15
SS - v4	0.2	0.15
WE - v4	0.2	0.2
EA - v4	0.2	0.2
MR - v4	0.2	0.2
IEQ - v4	0.2	0
Innovation - v4	0.2	0.2
RP - v4	0.2	0
Comments		incorrect way up filling up scorecards
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		
PART 3: Recommendation of Rating System	5 Pts Possible	0.05
Two or More Innovative Ideas	2	0
Are the innovative ideas realistic/attainable?	1	0.05
Were the innovative ideas explained well, easily understood?	1	0
Convincing	1	0
Comments		Should have focused energy on parts of questions with most value first. Part 2 has a lot of research but its worth the least amount of points
	10	3.85

15 Total Points Possible

Problem # 2 - Life Cycle Sustainability Analysis - Lighting		Long Beach
#1.a Correct light fixture take-off QTY	1	1
#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	1
#2.b Identify criteria and formaula used	3	1
#2.c Organization of answer/data	0.5	0.5
#3.a Select correct subcontractor	2	0
#4.a Quality of incentives/rebates (1 pt ea. - max of 3)	3	1
#4.b Organization of answer/findings	0.5	0
#5.a Correct selection of light fixture	1	0
	15	5.5

No narrative to describe graphs.

Good info, but no conclusions provided

		15 Total Points Possible	CSU Long Beach
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	0.5
Part I #3	Carbon Footprint of each supplier / lowest	4	1
Part I #4	Best value supplier	2	0
Part II #1	Carbon footprint of crew	2	1.5
Part II #2	Carbon footprint of crew - local	1.5	1
Part II #3	Carbon footprint of crew - carpool	1.5	1
	Total	15	6

Notes

Pt I # 1 - did not include RFI response in solution
Pt I # 2 - did not include City Park in analysis or tax in price. Did not state which souce was least expensive.

Pt I # 3 - did not include Slip Diamond in analysis

Pt I # 4 - did not appear to answer this problem
Pt II - math error and incorrect units
Overall - do not need to include superfluous images

15 Total Points Possible

CSULB

Problem #4 - Water Usage and Collection		
#1. a) Forumula	2	1
#1 b) ET_O	1	0.5
#1.c) Landscaped Areas	1	0.5
#1.d) Answer	1	0.5
#1.e) Organization	1	1
#2.a) Rainfall data by month	1	1
#2.b) Rainwater Collection Formula	1.5	0.5
#2.c) Collection Area	1.5	0
#2.d) Answer - Size of Cistern	1	0
#2.e) Organization	1	0
#3.a) Volume Calculation	0.5	0.25
#3.c) Graph/Method	1.5	1
#3.a) Answer & Organization	1	0.5
	15	6.75

didn't calculate water usage by month based on ET values by month

didn't do any calcs for rainwater collection

20 Total Points Possible

CSULB

	Problem #5 - Onsite Renewable Energy			
#1.a	Correct quantities	2	1	Wrong roof size
	Work is shown, correct equation is used	2	1	
	Marked up drawing is accurate and realistic	1	0.5	Wrong roof size
#1.b	Work is shown and is correct	1	0.5	
	Acknowledged factors other than initial cost	1	0.5	
	Narrative is clear and illustrates the rationale	2	1	
#1.c	i. Correct direction	1	0	
	ii. Correct angle	1	0	
	iii. Correct dates	0.5	0	
	iii. Correct angles	0.5	0	
#2a.	Product chosen, with cost and quantity	2	1	
#2.b.	cost of panel support structure	1	0	
#2.c	payback period, and cost assumptions	2	1	
#2.d	Projected cost of maintenance	1	0	
#3.a	Response is clear, concise, and realistic	0.5	0.25	
#3.b	Response is clear, concise, and realistic	0.5	0	
#3.c	Response is clear, concise, and realistic	0.5	0	
#3.d	Response is clear, concise, and realistic	0.5	0	
		20	6.75	